



3 1761 11968299 5

Government
Publications



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2023 with funding from
University of Toronto

<https://archive.org/details/31761119682995>



No. 1

Hansard

Official Report of Debates

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Third Session, 32nd Parliament

Monday, April 18, 1983

Speaker: Honourable John M. Turner

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

Contents of the proceedings reported in this issue of Hansard appears at the back.

An alphabetical list of members of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario, together with lists of members of the executive council and the parliamentary assistants, also appears at the back as an appendix.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.



Hansard subscription price is \$15.00 per session, from: Hansard and Sessional Subscriptions, Publications Centre, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 965-2238.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Monday, April 18, 1983

The Third Session of the 32nd Parliament of the province of Ontario opened at 3 p.m. for the dispatch of business pursuant to a proclamation of the Honourable J. B. Aird, Lieutenant Governor of the province.

The Honourable the Lieutenant Governor, having entered the chamber and being seated upon the throne, was pleased to open the session with the following gracious speech.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Hon. Mr. Aird: Pray be seated.

Mr. Speaker and members of the Legislative Assembly, Ontario is now emerging from a period that has proven to be difficult for all jurisdictions within the industrial western world. The economic setbacks experienced in 1982 were, beyond doubt, more severe than any public or private observers had foreseen. For the first time since 1975, real output for the industrialized economies as a whole declined; and, more disturbing, unemployment rose to unprecedented post-war heights. Clearly, steps must be taken to overcome this situation.

It is gratifying to be able to report to this Legislature, therefore, that we are now witnessing several positive signs, both in the resumption of economic activity with increased employment as well as in the fight against inflation. The restoration of confidence has begun.

The personal economic outlook for many Ontarians, however, will remain challenging. My government is well aware of the hardships imposed by current high levels of unemployment. These hardships have been borne by men and women in all regions and from all walks of life. The lessening of these difficulties will continue to head the list of matters requiring the full attention of this Legislature.

It is obvious that no single province has at its disposal the means to solve all of the problems resulting from current economic conditions. However, the government of Ontario will continue to give the highest priority towards the fashioning of initiatives designed to provide badly needed job opportunities.

The last provincial budget outlined a number of such initiatives. The job creation program which was announced at that time created some

40,290 jobs at a cost of \$176 million. An additional \$150 million was later provided for direct job creation projects and for co-operative programs with the government of Canada. Funding for employment programs for young people, who have experienced higher unemployment levels than the rest of the work force, has been increased to \$120 million. Through these and other measures, the government has endeavoured to assist in creating conditions conducive to economic recovery. In recent months there have been indications that additional developments have occurred which should aid in this process.

For example, there has been a significant slowdown in inflation. Consumer price increases in Canada have declined from an annual rate of 12.5 per cent in 1981 to the six per cent range during the last few months. Moderation of unit labour cost increases and the favourable outlook for food and energy prices will both contribute to continued dampening of overall price increases in the year ahead.

Trends in wage and salary settlements have also contributed to the growing confidence in our ability to cope with inflation. In the public sector many jurisdictions in Canada, including Ontario, have demonstrated a commitment to ending the inflationary environment through the implementation of public sector wage and price restraint, and in the private sector there is evidence that major wage settlements are also moderating.

Concurrently in this country and in the United States there are signs that economic activity is increasing. Interest rates have declined substantially. In specific sectors—housing, appliances, autos—there has been a perceptible quickening in the pace of activity. Recent reports reveal that consumer confidence has increased significantly, and nothing will offer a surer sign of improving economic conditions than a decision by individual consumers to enter the marketplace.

The stage now appears set, therefore, for an enduring economic recovery in Ontario and Canada. The evidence is clear that such recovery and the increased employment opportunities that will result from it will centre primarily

on the private sector. The responsibility of government, including that of Ontario, will be to create the proper climate for the private sector to foster that economic growth, to complement the efforts of business and industry through appropriate plans and programs, and to assist directly and in a variety of ways those citizens who, for whatever reasons, require help, including assistance in finding appropriate job opportunities, within the work force.

3:10 p.m.

The importance of a well-trained labour force for economic recovery is obvious. Ontario possesses one of the most highly developed systems for manpower training in North America, delivered in the main through its community college network. Last summer my government took the lead in developing, with the government of Canada, a new national training program which will further institutional training and at the same time give significant additional financial support for training within industrial settings. As the economy improves, it is equally important for employers to fulfil their training obligations by increasing their commitment to and participation in these programs.

While job training will demand particular attention during this period in which industrial requirements and the technology that supports them are changing so rapidly, we cannot lose sight of the need to continue to provide high-quality programs of all types within our educational system. This will require constant examination of school organization and curriculum content as has been evidenced by the recent secondary education review project. Further, to ensure the most effective results for the resources available, new developments, both in terms of programs and facilities, will of necessity be approved on a priority basis.

It is clear too that as new technology takes hold, traditional job patterns will change and, in some cases, disappear. This in turn will give rise to significant changes in the style and nature of life for many Ontario citizens. Rather than wait and react to these events as they unfold, my government intends to undertake an extensive and serious study of these projected developments so that we are in the strongest possible position to assist Ontarians to adjust to the changing circumstances within our industrial and business sectors.

In times such as these organized labour plays a vital role, not only in representing the interests of individual members but also in working together with business and the government to

find practical solutions to our common difficulties. It has, for example, undertaken constructive co-operation with management in the introduction of pilot projects in quality of working life across the province. These efforts will be extended and enhanced in coming months as a further example of what can be achieved through co-operative efforts involving labour, business and government.

Further, sustaining the turnaround in economic activity will require a continuing commitment by all parts of our society to act responsibly. For both those in the private and public sector, this will mean continuing the trend towards moderation in the demands placed on the economy—in wage and salary settlements and in the movement of prices. Failure to achieve such restraint will shatter the growth of confidence and slow the momentum of economic expansion.

Constructive intergovernmental co-operation is also critical to economic recovery and the restoration of public confidence, and it is with this in mind that my government once again calls upon the Prime Minister of Canada to convene a first ministers' meeting on the economy at an early date. Such a meeting could serve to chart the course of a broadly based economic recovery during the remainder of this decade. We must build and give impetus to the emerging climate of optimism. Our citizens deserve no less. While the recently established federal Royal Commission on the Economic Union and Development Prospects for Canada was a welcome initiative, we cannot rely solely on this longer-term process to spur lasting economic recovery. Enhanced federal-provincial co-operation is required now.

For its part, the government of Ontario is resolved to bear its full share of responsibility and to continue to provide leadership in the weeks and months ahead. My ministers, therefore, in their several responsibilities, will be placing before you, in this session, components of a clearly defined three-part program. Measures will be introduced to contribute to an enduring economic recovery which will create the jobs necessary to allow all Ontarians to lead productive lives; to strengthen the management of the province's affairs; and to respond to the critical concerns and needs of Ontarians, in all areas of their lives, through this adjustment period.

The budget, to be presented in May, will form a key element of this program. It will address the broad directions the government will take in

meeting the fiscal and economic policy challenges facing Ontario today. Emphasis will be placed on strengthening the province's longer-term economic potential.

In the coming year, the government will continue to set priorities and co-ordinate economic initiatives to ensure that our province is able to take full advantage of the many resource and technological opportunities that will be available in the future. Many initiatives already in place will demand further fiscal resources and strategic guidance.

While continuing this work, we will strive constantly to seek out new initiatives. Specifically, we can expect new projects and programs in such fields as fusion fuel technology, interregional transit, assistance to single-industry communities in northern Ontario, development and marketing of pollution abatement equipment, development of a Canadian school microcomputer and educational software, and tourism.

These initiatives will be supplemented further in the coming 12 months by a number of new measures. My government's goal is to promote and encourage the development of internationally competitive industries, including the agricultural sector, which will result in the creation of new jobs and increases in real incomes, both corporate and personal. Our goals, for which policies and programs will be outlined, are: to stimulate business investment significantly over the next two years; to double foreign trade over the next five years; to increase domestic market expansion; to increase the productivity and entrepreneurship of small and medium-sized businesses; and to increase innovation in all sectors of our economy.

Of particular importance to economic recovery and growth in Ontario is the state of the automotive industry. For this reason, during the past year Ontario has pursued discussions with the government of Canada and business and labour leaders to promote its revitalization and future development. In this regard, as a short-term measure, we continue to advocate, in the strongest possible terms, restriction in the number of imported cars to allow the domestic industry time to adjust to the new circumstances and, more important, to permit time to obtain agreement from foreign manufacturers to increase significantly Canadian content in their products. Since we are not satisfied that federal officials are acting vigorously enough on this matter, we intend to increase our own efforts.

We have supported, in recent months, the establishment of the Task Force on Canadian

Motor Vehicles and Automotive Parts Strategy and look forward to the release of its report. Without prejudging the findings of this report, we believe that the continued viability of the Canadian automotive industry will only be ensured in the longer term by requiring all vehicle manufacturers sharing the Canadian market to operate under the same requirements as those mandated under the 1965 Canada-United States automotive products trade agreement. The importance of the automotive industry to our overall economic good health requires no less.

The problems that have shadowed the world economy over the past few years have taken a particularly heavy toll in the farm community. Farmers have been hit financially by high interest rates and further squeezed by low commodity prices. The government acted to alleviate this situation by providing a temporary bridging to improved economic times.

Originally, the Ontario farm adjustment assistance program was scheduled to expire on December 31, 1982. In light of the current economic situation and the unlikely prospects of significant improvement in commodity prices, the program has been extended. In addition, Ontario, in co-operation with Saskatchewan, has taken the lead in designing a national tripartite stabilization program to insure producers against volatile commodity prices in the future.

The ministry will reinforce its efforts in the area of financial counselling, designed to assist producers in optimizing their business decisions. Initiatives will also be taken to support the long-term development of our northern Ontario agricultural resources.

In addition, no farmer should fear the loss of his product through the failure of another business or misrepresentation of a buyer. Complementing the livestock financial protection program, successfully introduced for beef producers last year, it is our objective to expand this type of protection. For example, the Grain Elevator Storage Act, currently under review, will be updated to provide better protection for farmers who store their grain in elevators.

3:20 p.m.

In order to remain competitive, Ontario agriculture requires a continuous stream of young, highly qualified entrants to carry on in this vitally important sector of the economy. The government recognizes the many problems faced today by young farmers. Accordingly, we shall be proposing measures to assist young people

entering agriculture for the first time to get a fair start.

My government will continue the programs established to reduce potential and actual pollution of our air and water by international sources and will continue, by means of consultation and, if necessary, by intervention, to represent Ontario's interests and to ensure that the wellbeing of our people is taken into account in the formulation of remedial measures.

The people of Ontario enjoy a quality of housing second to none in the world. We plan to maintain this standard with programs designed to stimulate housing construction both to meet the shelter needs of home owners and tenants and to provide employment in the construction industry and the many related industries which ebb and flow with the housing market.

It is our intention in designing and executing these programs to work closely with our partner governments at the national and municipal levels. This partnership will yield maximum efficiency in creating programs to meet our housing needs community by community. Such a partnership will provide continuing sensitivity to the changing needs of senior citizens, the single-parent family, the disabled and other special needs groups.

My government believes that there is a need to accelerate progress in the area of women's issues, and while considerable advancement has been made in recent years to enhance opportunities for the women of Ontario, much remains to be done. To ensure, therefore, that women's essential contribution to the social and economic wellbeing of the province receives further support, my government will move to name a senior minister who will be responsible for women's issues with a complete mandate to review, initiate, direct and promote policies favourable to and in support of women in Ontario society.

This minister will have wide-ranging responsibility for providing a focus for the government and the public on concerns that affect 52.4 per cent of our population and for taking steps to close the gap in wages that has too long existed between men and women as well as the proportion of women who are clustered in particular areas of employment.

Ontario is widely envied throughout the world on many counts, not the least of which is the sound conduct of its financial and administrative affairs. In five out of the last seven years, my government has held its expenditure growth below the rate of inflation, freeing available

resources for the private sector and for budgetary stabilization initiatives. Further evidence of this can be noted in the fact that, were our financial affairs in the same situation as those of our national government, the provincial deficit would be four times that currently projected. During this same seven-year period, Ontario's public service employment has decreased by 6.1 per cent, leaving Ontario with the fewest public servants, as measured on a per capita basis, of all Canadian provinces. It is a testimonial to our employees that this has been accomplished while maintaining the quality of our services to the public.

In the coming year this tradition of sound management will be continued. Renewed emphasis will be placed on value-for-money auditing and the examination of all ongoing programs to determine that they continue to serve the purposes for which they were intended and that the benefits are commensurate with the costs. The government's capital construction program for the public sector requirements will aim at saving tax dollars in high-cost leasing areas. Finally, a number of government regulatory functions, such as the building and fire code regulations and the Mining Act, will be reformed and streamlined.

My government will strive to provide an equality of services across Ontario. The one-window approach will be expanded to allow more Ontarians to deal with their government more directly and more simply on a face-to-face basis throughout the province.

Further, my government recognizes that the retirement income system can be improved at both the national and provincial levels. Last December the government of Canada created a special parliamentary task force to develop recommendations for achieving such improvements. We will urge this task force to proceed with its deliberations as quickly as possible so that needed reforms can be recommended and adopted. To assist in this process, my government will seek to present its views to the government of Canada later this year. These views will emphasize the importance of freedom of choice for individuals in preparing for retirement and the need to provide more adequate retirement income protection for many members of our society.

The Public Service Superannuation Act will be amended to eliminate the unfair practice of discontinuing a survivor's pension upon remarriage. This change will apply retroactively to those individuals, mostly women, who have

been inadvertently penalized by the current provisions.

Trust companies perform a vital role in Ontario as desposit-taking institutions and as administrators of estates and trusts. They also provide a major source of residential mortgage loans. It is my government's belief that public confidence in the trust industry of this province should be unquestioned. In furtherance of this objective, the Loan and Trust Corporations Amendment Act was passed in the previous session and a white paper will be tabled outlining a form of regulation that will address the need to maintain the public's confidence and also enable the trust industry to develop and maintain itself in these changing economic times.

Changes in the demographic composition of Ontario's population are constantly creating new challenges. Currently 10 per cent of the provincial population is over the age of 65. In less than 10 years, the number of those over 85 will increase by nearly 50 per cent. These changes will necessitate enhancement of existing services and the development of new and innovative approaches to meet evolving needs.

In order to ensure a comprehensive approach to the needs of the elderly in the years ahead, my government has completed a major review of programs and services to the elderly. While a number of initiatives will be proposed with respect to institutional and community health services, particular emphasis will be placed upon the support services in related programs which will enable elderly citizens to continue to live independently in the community.

Mon gouvernement est fier, et à juste titre, des progrès qu'il a accomplis dans la prestation des services à la population francophone de la province, en particulier dans le domaine de l'éducation. Cette année, la population scolaire de langue française comprend environ 93,706 élèves inscrits dans 276 écoles séparées catholiques, 13 écoles élémentaires publiques et 65 écoles secondaires de langue française ou mixtes. En fait, environ 96 pour cent de la population scolaire de langue française dans la province bénéficie actuellement de l'enseignement en français, en tout ou en partie.

Dans la poursuite de nos efforts pour assurer l'égalité des chances en éducation à tous les élèves de la province, nous présenterons, après avoir consulté le public, des amendements à la loi sur l'éducation dans le but de:

Reconnaître le droit de chaque élève francophone de faire ses études en français;

Veiller à ce que les conseils de l'éducation établissent, dans certaines conditions, des sections de langue minoritaire composées de conseillers scolaires élus par les électeurs du groupe linguistique minoritaire, lors des élections de 1985;

Permettre au ministre de l'Éducation de résoudre les différends entre les conseils scolaires et la Commission des langues d'enseignement de l'Ontario quant aux mesures à prendre.

Il convient de noter que toutes ces dispositions s'appliqueront également aux Ontariens anglophones dans les circonscriptions scolaires où ils se trouvent en minorité.

3:30 p.m.

My government is justifiably proud of the progress it has made in providing services to our province's French-speaking population, particularly in the field of education. This year the French-language school population comprises approximately 93,706 pupils registered in 276 Roman Catholic separate schools, 13 public elementary schools and 65 French or mixed secondary schools. In effect, approximately 96 per cent of the French-speaking school age population of this province currently receives its education, in whole or in part, in French.

To complete our efforts of ensuring equal educational opportunity for all pupils in this province, following public consultation, amendments to the Education Act will be introduced: to recognize the right of every French-speaking pupil to an education in the French language; to ensure that boards of education, under certain conditions, establish minority language sections consisting of trustees elected by minority language electors for the 1985 elections; to enable the Minister of Education to resolve situations in which a school board or the Languages of Instruction Commission of Ontario may disagree on an appropriate course of action. It should be noted that all these provisions will apply equally to English-speaking Ontarians in those school board areas where they are in a minority position.

Ontario will fulfil the commitment it made at the meeting of first ministers and aboriginal leaders to extend the provisions of Canada's new Constitution respecting the process for identifying and defining aboriginal rights. My government has been at the forefront of constitutional discussions to guarantee equal status of native men and women, to ensure that governments consult aboriginal peoples in advance of constitutional amendments that could affect

them and to entrench future constitutional discussions respecting the rights of native peoples.

In order to implement the terms of the accord signed by first ministers, this Legislature will be asked to consider and support a resolution authorizing a constitutional amendment to sections of the Constitution Act respecting an ongoing process, the equal status of native men and women, clarification of the term "treaty rights" and guaranteed consultation in event of future constitutional reform affecting native peoples.

My government has completed a systematic review of its legislation and programs as part of its commitment to the provisions of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms and to the primacy provisions of the new Human Rights Code. Legislative measures will be brought forward over time to ensure that Ontario law and practice is fully consistent with the important principles expressed in the charter and the Human Rights Code.

This year, preparations will continue apace for Ontario's bicentennial in 1984. Two hundred years ago, the first large major settlements of our province were established by those who migrated from the United States, following the American Revolution, joining with the native and French population of the then Ontario to build a new community and a new future under what would become responsible parliamentary democracy. The bicentennial will be a community-based celebration responsive to the many cultures and identities that have built our province during the last two centuries and an affirmation of the common opportunity we share to build on this history for the future.

My government is particularly pleased and honoured at the prospect that our Queen, Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, will be with us on this important occasion in 1984. Her presence, grace, warmth and humanity symbolize more than anything the continuity of the liberty, freedom and opportunity that our way of life sustains for Ontarians of all origins, colours and creeds. It is important that we seize this opportunity to affirm, in a modest yet inspiring fashion, that we have much of which to be proud, much for which to thank those who have preceded us and even more to which to aspire in the future.

Honourable members, the general outline I have set before you today towards the combined goals of economic recovery, sound man-

agement of our public affairs and meeting the varied needs of Ontario's people will of necessity be expanded through more detailed statements describing the specific plans and programs my government intends to introduce. You may look forward, therefore, to a series of announcements by my ministers in the weeks to come that will set before this House a variety of proposals that will ensure continued progress in these major areas.

May Divine Providence attend your deliberations. In our Sovereign's name, I thank you.

God bless the Queen and Canada.

The Honourable the Lieutenant Governor was pleased to retire from the chamber.

Prayers.

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, if I may rise on a point of privilege: With genuine regret, because I was not intending to rise today in my place, I thought I should bring to your attention a discourtesy by the government in not delivering the traditional copy of the throne speech to the Leader of the Opposition. This could be merely an oversight, then again it could be seen at one with other events of the day whereby access to the lockup was restricted to members of the opposition party. I commend these two occurrences to you for your investigation and would appreciate your reporting back to the House.

Mr. Speaker: I beg to inform the House that to prevent mistakes, I have obtained a copy of His Honour's speech, which I will now read.

Reading dispensed with.

3:40 p.m.

INTRODUCTION OF BILL

PROVINCIAL COURTS AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. McMurtry moved, seconded by Hon. Mr. Wells, first reading of Bill 1, An Act to amend the Provincial Courts Act.

Motion agreed to.

MOTION

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

Hon. Mr. Wells moved that the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor to this House be taken into consideration tomorrow, Tuesday, April 19.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 3:41 p.m.

ERRATUM

No.	Page	Column	Line	Should read:
212	7638	1	52	Speaker. The member for London North (Mr. Van Horne) asked me last Friday, February

APPENDIX A

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS*

(125 members)

Third Session of the 32nd Parliament

Lieutenant Governor: Hon. J. B. Aird, OC, QC

Speaker: Hon. John M. Turner

Clerk of the House: Roderick Lewis, QC

- Allen, R. (Hamilton West NDP)
 Andrewes, P. W. (Lincoln PC)
Ashe, Hon. G. L., Minister of Revenue (Durham West PC)
Baetz, Hon. R. C., Minister of Tourism and Recreation (Ottawa West PC)
 Barlow, W. W. (Cambridge PC)
Bennett, Hon. C. F., Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Ottawa South PC)
Bernier, Hon. L., Minister of Northern Affairs (Kenora PC)
Birch, Hon. M., Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Scarborough East PC)
 Boudria, D. (Prescott-Russell L)
 Bradley, J. J. (St. Catharines L)
 Brandt, A. S. (Sarnia PC)
 Breaugh, M. J. (Oshawa NDP)
 Breithaupt, J. R. (Kitchener L)
 Bryden, M. H. (Beaches-Woodbine NDP)
 Cassidy, M. (Ottawa Centre NDP)
 Charlton, B. A. (Hamilton Mountain NDP)
 Conway, S. G. (Renfrew North L)
 Cooke, D. S. (Windsor-Riverside NDP)
 Copps, S. M. (Hamilton Centre L)
 Cousens, D., Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole House (York Centre PC)
 Cunningham, E. G. (Wentworth North L)
 Cureatz, S. L., Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole House (Durham East PC)
Davis, Hon. W. G., Premier (Brampton PC)
 Dean, G. H. (Wentworth PC)
 Di Santo, O. (Downsview NDP)
Drea, Hon. F., Minister of Community and Social Services (Scarborough Centre PC)
 Eakins, J. F. (Victoria-Haliburton L)
Eaton, Hon. R. G., Minister without Portfolio (Middlesex PC)
 Edighoffer, H. A. (Perth L)
Elgie, Hon. R. G., Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (York East PC)
 Elston, M. J. (Huron-Bruce L)
 Epp, H. A. (Waterloo North L)
 Eves, E. L. (Parry Sound PC)
 Fish, S. A. (St. George PC)
 Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP)
 Gillies, P. A. (Brantford PC)
 Gordon, J. K. (Sudbury PC)
 Grande, T. (Oakwood NDP)
Gregory, Hon. M. E. C., Minister without Portfolio (Mississauga East PC)
Grossman, Hon. L. S., Minister of Health (St. Andrew-St. Patrick PC)
 Haggerty, R. (Erie L)
 Harris, M. D. (Nipissing PC)
 Havrot, E. M. (Timiskaming PC)
Henderson, Hon. L. C., Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Lambton PC)
 Hennessy, M. (Fort William PC)
 Hodgson, W. (York North PC)
 Johnson, J. M. (Wellington-Dufferin-Peel PC)
 Johnston, R. F. (Scarborough West NDP)
 Jones, T. (Mississauga North PC)
 Kells, M. C. (Humber PC)
 Kennedy, R. D. (Mississauga South PC)
 Kerr, G. A. (Burlington South PC)
 Kerrio, V. G. (Niagara Falls L)
 Kolyan, A. (Lakeshore PC)
 Lane, J. G. (Algoma-Manitoulin PC)
 Laughren, F. (Nickel Belt NDP)
Leluk, Hon. N. G., Minister of Correctional Services (York West PC)
 Lupusella, A. (Dovercourt NDP)
 Mackenzie, R. W. (Hamilton East NDP)
 MacQuarrie, R. W. (Carleton East PC)
 Mancini, R. (Essex South L)
 Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
McCaffrey, Hon. R. B., Minister of Citizenship and Culture (Armourdale PC)
McCague, Hon. G. R., Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet (Dufferin-Simcoe PC)
 McClellan, R. A. (Bellwoods NDP)
 McEwen, J. E. (Frontenac-Addington L)
 McGuigan, J. F. (Kent-Elgin L)
 McKessock, R. (Grey L)
 McLean, A. K. (Simcoe East PC)
McMurtry, Hon. R. R., Attorney General (Eglinton PC)
 McNeil, R. K. (Elgin PC)

Miller, Hon. F. S., Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics (Muskoka PC)

Miller, G. I. (Haldimand-Norfolk L)

Mitchell, R. C. (Carleton PC)

Newman, B. (Windsor-Walkerville L)

Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)

Norton, Hon. K. C., Minister of the Environment (Kingston and the Islands PC)

O'Neil, H. P. (Quinte L)

Peterson, D. R. (London Centre L)

Philip, E. T. (Etobicoke NDP)

Piché, R. L. (Cochrane North PC)

Pollock, J. (Hastings-Peterborough PC)

Pope, Hon. A. W., Minister of Natural Resources (Cochrane South PC)

Rae, R. K. (York South NDP)

Ramsay, Hon. R. H., Minister of Labour (Sault Ste. Marie PC)

Reed, J. A. (Halton-Burlington L)

Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L-Lab.)

Renwick, J. A. (Riverdale NDP)

Riddell, J. K. (Huron-Middlesex L)

Robinson, A. M. (Scarborough-Ellesmere PC)

Rotenberg, D. (Wilson Heights PC)

Roy, A. J. (Ottawa East L)

Runciman, R. W. (Leeds PC)

Ruprecht, T. (Parkdale L)

Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)

Samis, G. R. (Cornwall NDP)

Sargent, E. C. (Grey-Bruce L)

Scrivener, M. (St. David PC)

Sheppard, H. N. (Northumberland PC)

Shymko, Y. R. (High Park-Swansea PC)

Snow, Hon. J. W., Minister of Transportation and Communications (Oakville PC)

Spensieri, M. A. (Yorkview L)

Stephenson, Hon. B. M., Minister of Education and Minister of Colleges and Universities (York Mills PC)

Sterling, Hon. N. W., Provincial Secretary for Justice (Carleton-Grenville PC)

Stevenson, K. R. (Durham-York PC)

Stokes, J. E. (Lake Nipigon NDP)

Swart, M. L. (Welland-Thorold NDP)

Sweeney, J. (Kitchener-Wilmot L)

Taylor, Hon. G. W., Solicitor General (Simcoe Centre PC)

Taylor, J. A. (Prince Edward-Lennox PC)

Timbrell, Hon. D. R., Minister of Agriculture and Food (Don Mills PC)

Treleaven, R. L. (Oxford PC)

Turner, Hon. J. M., Speaker (Peterborough PC)

Van Horne, R. G. (London North L)

Villeneuve, O. F. (Stormont, Dundas and Glen-garry PC)

Walker, Hon. G. W., Minister of Industry and Trade (London South PC)

Watson, A. N. (Chatham-Kent PC)

Welch, Hon. R. S., Minister of Energy and Deputy Premier (Brock PC)

Wells, Hon. T. L., Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Scarborough North PC)

Wildman, B. (Algoma NDP)

Williams, J. R. (Oriole PC)

Wiseman, Hon. D. J., Minister of Government Services (Lanark PC)

Worton, H. (Wellington South L)

Wrye, W. M. (Windsor-Sandwich L)

Yakabuski, P. J. (Renfrew South PC)

MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

Davis, Hon. W. G., Premier and President of the Council

Welch, Hon. R. S., Minister of Energy and Deputy Premier

Wells, Hon. T. L., Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs

Bernier, Hon. L., Minister of Northern Affairs

Snow, Hon. J. W., Minister of Transportation and Communications

Birch, Hon. M., Provincial Secretary for Social Development

Bennett, Hon. C. F., Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing

Miller, Hon. F. S., Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics

Timbrell, Hon. D. R., Minister of Agriculture and Food

Stephenson, Hon. B. M., Minister of Education and Minister of Colleges and Universities

McMurtry, Hon. R. R., Attorney General

Henderson, Hon. L. C., Provincial Secretary for Resources Development

Norton, Hon. K. C., Minister of the Environment

Drea, Hon. F., Minister of Community and Social Services

Grossman, Hon. L., Minister of Health

McCague, Hon. G., Chairman of Management Board of Cabinet and Chairman of Cabinet

Baetz, Hon. R. C., Minister of Tourism and Recreation

Wiseman, Hon. D. J., Minister of Government Services

Elgie, Hon. R. G., Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations

Walker, Hon. G. W., Minister of Industry and Trade

Gregory, Hon. M. E. C., Minister without Portfolio

Pope, Hon. A. W., Minister of Natural Resources
Leluk, Hon. N. G., Minister of Correctional Services

Ashe, Hon. G. L., Minister of Revenue

Ramsay, Hon. R. H., Minister of Labour

McCaffrey, Hon. R. B., Minister of Citizenship and Culture

Sterling, Hon. N. W., Provincial Secretary for Justice

Taylor, Hon. G. W., Solicitor General

Eaton, Hon. R. G., Minister without Portfolio

PARLIAMENTARY ASSISTANTS

Andrewes, P. W. (Lincoln), assistant to the Minister of Energy

Brandt, A. S. (Sarnia), assistant to the Minister of Labour

Dean, G. H. (Wentworth), assistant to the Minister of Education and the Minister of Colleges and Universities

Fish, S. A. (St. George), assistant to the Minister of Citizenship and Culture

Gillies, P. A. (Brantford), assistant to the Provincial Secretary for Social Development

Gordon, J. K. (Sudbury), assistant to the Minister of Health

Hennessy, M. (Fort William), assistant to the Minister of Northern Affairs

Hodgson, W. (York North), assistant to the Minister of Government Services

Jones, T. (Mississauga North), assistant to the Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics

Kennedy, R. D. (Mississauga South), assistant to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs

Lane, J. G. (Algoma-Manitoulin), assistant to the Minister of Industry and Trade

MacQuarrie, R. W. (Carleton East), assistant to the Solicitor General

McNeil, R. K. (Elgin), assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food

Mitchell, R. C. (Carleton), assistant to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations

Rotenberg, D. (Wilson Heights), assistant to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing

Stevenson, K. R. (Durham-York), assistant to the Minister of the Environment

Watson, A. N. (Chatham-Kent), assistant to the Minister of Community and Social Services

Williams, J. R. (Orillia), assistant to the Minister of Revenue

Yakubski, P. J. (Renfrew South), assistant to the Minister of Natural Resources

STANDING COMMITTEES

Administration of justice: chairman, Mr. Treleaven; members, Messrs. Brandt, Breithaupt, Elston, Eves, Mitchell, Piché, Renwick, Spensieri, Stevenson, Swart and Watson; clerk, D. Arnott.

General government: chairman, Mr. Barlow; vice-chairman, Mr. J. A. Taylor; members, Messrs. Charlton, Dean, Eakins, Gordon, Haggerty, Hennessy, J. M. Johnson, Lane, McKessock and Samis; clerk, F. Carrozza.

Resources development: chairman, Mr. Harris; vice-chairman, Mr. Andrewes; members, Ms. Fish, Messrs. Kolyn, Laughren, McNeil, J. A. Reed, Riddell, Stokes, Sweeney, Villeneuve and Williams; clerk, A. Richardson.

Social development: chairman, Mr. Shymko; vice-chairman, Mr. Gillies; members, Messrs. Allen, Boudria, Ms. Copps, Messrs. Cureatz, R. F. Johnston, Kells, McGuigan, Pollock, Robinson and Sheppard; clerk, G. White.

Members' services: chairman, Mr. Robinson; vice-chairman, Mr. Hodgson; members, Messrs. Cassidy, Grande, Havrot, Jones, MacQuarrie, McLean, G. I. Miller, Rotenberg, Ruprecht and Wrye; clerk, L. Mellor.

Procedural affairs: chairman, Mr. Kerr; vice-chairman, Mr. Rotenberg; members, Messrs. Breaugh, Charlton, Edighoffer, Epp, J. M. Johnson, Lane, MacQuarrie, Mancini, Treleaven and Watson; clerk, S. Forsyth.

Public accounts: chairman, Mr. T. P. Reid; vice-chairman, Mr. Kolyn; members, Messrs. Bradley, Cunningham, Havrot, Mackenzie, Philip, Sargent, Mrs. Scrivener, Messrs. J. A. Taylor, Villeneuve and Yakubski; clerk, G. White.

Regulations and other statutory instruments: chairman, Mr. Eves; vice-chairman, Mr. Barlow; members, Ms. Bryden, Messrs. Di Santo, Gordon, Hennessy, Hodgson, Jones, Kerrio, McEwen, McLean and Van Horne; clerk, L. Mellor.

SELECT COMMITTEE

Ombudsman: chairman, Mr. Runciman; members, Messrs. Boudria, Cooke, Eakins, Hennessy, Hodgson, Lupusella, MacQuarrie, Mitchell, Piché, Shymko and Van Horne; clerk, G. White.

*The lists in this appendix, brought up to date as necessary, are published in Hansard on the first Friday of each month and in the first and last issues of each session.

CONTENTS

Monday, April 18, 1983

Speech from the Throne , the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor.	3
Motion	
Throne speech debate , Mr. Wells, agreed to.	8
First reading	
Provincial Courts Amendment Act , Bill 1, Mr. McMurtry, agreed to.	8
Other business	
Adjournment	8
Erratum	9
Appendix	
Alphabetical list of members of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario, members of the executive council, parliamentary assistants and members of committees.	10

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Aird, Hon. J. B., Lieutenant Governor
 Peterson, D. R. (London Centre L)
 Turner, Hon. J. M., Speaker (Peterborough PC)
 Wells, Hon. T. L., Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Scarborough North PC)



Hansard

Official Report of Debates

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Third Session, 32nd Parliament

Tuesday, April 19, 1983

Speaker: Honourable John M. Turner

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

Contents of the proceedings reported in this issue of Hansard appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of the speakers taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is \$15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, Information Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 965-2238.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Tuesday, April 19, 1983

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

COMMISSION ON ELECTION CONTRIBUTIONS AND EXPENSES

Mr. Speaker: I beg to inform the House that I have today laid upon the table the sixth report of the Commission on Election Contributions and Expenses containing recommendations with respect to the indemnities and allowances and salaries of members of the Legislative Assembly.

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY

STRIKEBREAKING LEGISLATION

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a statement about the tragic death on April 9 of Claude Dougdeen, an employee of Alcan Building Products Ltd.

As members know, Mr. Dougdeen was picketing in support of a lawful strike at the time of his death, which occurred when a tractor trailer was entering the premises of Alcan on Warden Avenue in Scarborough.

Since the police investigation is continuing and since an inquest will be held, it would be inappropriate for me to comment on the precise circumstances of Mr. Dougdeen's death. However, there have been suggestions that it was caused in part by the inadequacy of our laws relating to strikes and picketing, and it is this aspect of the matter I wish to address briefly today.

Ontario, in common with almost every other jurisdiction in the western world, permits a struck employer to carry on business during the course of a strike. Two Canadian provinces have enacted legislation that in limited ways restricts this right. In British Columbia employers may not employ professional strikebreakers; that is, persons whose primary objective is to prevent, interfere with or break up a lawful strike. Quebec, while its labour code prohibits the use of external replacement employees to perform the work of bargaining unit employees during a lawful strike, permits the use of both management personnel and employees of independent contractors.

I might add that on the facts as they are known to me neither BC nor Quebec laws would

have prevented the use of the transport company that was servicing Alcan on the occasion in question, a company that had apparently performed services for Alcan intermittently in the past two years.

I have received representations from the president of the Ontario Federation of Labour and a number of his senior associates to the effect that I should propose amendments to the Labour Relations Act to outlaw the use of all replacement labour during a lawful strike, including the use of professional strikebreakers. I have undertaken to study those proposals and I shall do so.

However, in the meantime I wish to say that in my view it is quite unfair both to the government and to Mr. Dougdeen's family and friends, who must be suffering grievously, to suggest that his death resulted from deficiencies in the law.

That very serious allegation, which was attributed in the press to a senior staff member of the bargaining agent at Alcan, I must reject categorically. There is no jurisdiction of which I am aware in which all access to struck premises is prohibited. I am not aware of any law, in any jurisdiction, which would have prohibited the passage of the truck in the Alcan case.

Having said that, I wish to repeat that I intend to fulfil my undertaking and to consider the genuine and deeply held conviction expressed to me at last Friday's meeting by Mr. Pilkey and his colleagues that there is a need for legislative change. While I have the deepest sympathy for Mr. Dougdeen's family and profoundly regret his untimely and tragic death, my consideration of the need for legislative reform must be carried out objectively, which I undertake to do.

TRUST COMPANIES

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, since the House prorogued in February there have been a number of significant developments related to my ministry's response to the problems that arose in the Crown, Seaway and Greymac Trust companies. I would like to report to the members on how we have dealt with these problems to date and what we intend to do in the future.

My statement will be rather lengthy and I

therefore beg the indulgence of the House. I have in front of me, for tabling today, reports and documents which will add greatly to the information available to the Legislature. They are listed in an appendix to this statement.

The events of the past six months have engaged my ministry in two areas of its responsibility: one, the area of loan and trust corporations; and two, the area of rent review.

As far as the trust companies are concerned, there is no need to remind members of their importance to the economy of this province as financial intermediaries. They take deposits of funds from the general public, very often from small savers who are totally dependent on them for their honesty and expertise.

These companies in turn make investments, often on real estate, which, if the integrity of the system is to be maintained, must be made honestly, prudently and within the regulations of the Loan and Trust Corporations Act. This means the protection of depositors is a fundamental obligation of those who own and operate loan and trust companies.

As to rent review, members will recall the concerns that had been expressed in 1982 and earlier years about the application of the rent review process to the increased costs arising out of a sale and refinancing of a rental property. These concerns included not only the impact of legitimate arm's-length sales that led to rent increases but also the possibility of non-arm's-length arrangements being used artificially to inflate costs that were to be presented to the Residential Tenancy Commission in support of a rent increase.

In September 1982 it was reported that Cadillac Fairview had sold approximately 11,000 rental units to Greymac Credit Corp. for some \$270 million. While tenant concern was growing over the effect this sale would have on rent increases, it appears that Greymac Credit sold its interest in the apartments to Kilderkin Investments Ltd. at a price said to be about \$312.5 million. Kilderkin in turn is said to have sold the properties to 50 numbered companies at a stated price of \$500 million.

The last two sales, or "flips" as they are called, came to light after the conveyances from Cadillac Fairview were registered on November 5, 1982. The financing for the \$500-million transaction appeared to consist of an existing first mortgage put on the properties by Cadillac Fairview in the amount of \$110 million, a second mortgage taken back by Cadillac Fairview on the sale to Greymac Credit in the amount of

\$113 million, and what may loosely be described as a series of third mortgages totalling \$152 million advanced as to \$76 million from Seaway Trust Co., as to \$63 million by Crown Trust Co. and as to \$13 million by Greymac Trust Co. Finally, the balance of the alleged \$500-million sale price was said to include \$125 million put up by the 50 numbered companies, which were said to be beneficially owned by Saudi Arabian investors.

2:10 p.m.

These events raised important issues regarding both the trust companies and rent review. If, as we suspected, the \$500-million price was artificially inflated, then the mortgages on the properties of \$375 million, exactly 75 per cent of the supposed \$500-million purchase price, were unauthorized under the Loan and Trust Corporations Act, and the depositors might well be at risk. On the rent review side, an inflated price would represent an attempt to circumvent the protection afforded to the tenants of these buildings by our rent review legislation.

As members know, we have taken steps to protect both the tenants and the depositors of the trust companies. On November 16, I announced a rent restraint bill to limit rent increases attributable to the pass-through of financing costs arising out of the sale of rental property. New guidelines were issued by the Residential Tenancy Commission to deal with problems arising out of the financing costs of sales and resales of residential rental properties.

Mr. Stuart Thom, QC, was appointed to conduct an inquiry under the Public Inquiries Act into the application of the existing laws to the regulation of rents. Mr. James A. Morrison, of the firm of Touche Ross and Co., was appointed under section 152 of the Loan and Trust Corporations Act to make a special examination and audit of the books, accounts and securities and to inquire generally into the conduct of the businesses of Crown Trust, Seaway Trust, Greymac Trust, Seaway Mortgage and Greymac Mortgage.

On December 21, 1982, a bill was introduced and, with the co-operation of all members, passed the same day, amending the Loan and Trust Corporations Act by establishing an approval process for the transfer of shares of a loan and trust corporation under certain circumstances; enabling the Lieutenant Governor in Council to authorize the registrar to take possession and control of the assets of a loan and trust corporation or to impose limitations or conditions on the registry of such a corporation;

and, finally, by strengthening the enforcement provisions of that act.

On December 21 I also advised the House that a white paper would be issued on proposed amendments to the Loan and Trust Corporations Act.

By January 7, 1983, I had received, among other information, interim reports from Mr. Morrison as well as a critique of the appraisals said to have been relied on by the trust companies. On that date, the Lieutenant Governor in Council acted pursuant to the amendments to the Loan and Trust Corporations Act. This action was undertaken in the belief that in the case of each of Crown Trust, Seaway Trust and Greymac Trust, among other things, that there existed "a practice of or state of affairs within the corporation that is or may be prejudicial to the public interest or to the interests of the corporation's depositors, creditors or shareholders."

The orders in council authorized the registrar of loan and trust corporations to take possession and control of the assets of the three trust companies. The registrar was assisted in this regard by the firms of Touche Ross and Woods Gordon. This action was carried out in consultation with the Canada Deposit Insurance Corp., which I shall refer to as CDIC; and because of the applicable legal requirements, we were compelled to limit the withdrawal of deposits to the statutory limit of the insurance, which was then \$20,000.

I should point out that about the same time that the registrar was taking control of these three provincially incorporated trust companies, federal officials were asserting control under the federal act of the two federally incorporated mortgage companies, Seaway Mortgage and Greymac Mortgage.

Included in the material I am tabling here today are the three interim reports of Mr. Morrison and the appraisal critique prepared by A. E. LePage.

Following the takeover of the trust companies, the registrar had three objectives: (1) to carry on the businesses to the extent possible in the circumstances; (2) to review the state of affairs within the three companies; (3) to determine the appropriate courses of action to be taken.

On January 17 I reported to the House the highlights of the draft interim reports received from Woods Gordon with respect to Crown Trust and from Touche Ross with respect to Seaway Trust and Greymac Trust. Woods Gor-

don advised in part that Crown Trust, at January 7, 1983, did not appear to be in compliance with certain liquidity, investment and borrowing requirements of the Loan and Trust Corporations Act and that, as of that date, the company could not be considered a viable going concern in the absence of substantial injection of additional capital, interim support to assist in meeting liquidity demands and restoration of confidence by the public and the financial community.

Touche Ross advised that neither Seaway Trust nor Greymac Trust had a borrowing base for the purposes of section 118 of the act to support its deposits and other borrowings, that both companies had substantial parts of their mortgage portfolios invested in mortgages related to Kilderkin Investments Ltd. and that in most, if not all, instances of Kilderkin-related mortgages, the Seaway or Greymac mortgage was subsequent to a first and sometimes a second mortgage and represented a loan in excess of 75 per cent of the value of the property as permitted by the act.

Also on January 17 I advised the House that a complete review of our internal administrative procedures in the area of financial institutions would be carried out, initially by an internal review team but if necessary by an outside organization that is familiar with the operations of financial institutions and the problems that arise in the course of administering regulatory legislation.

On January 17 the Honourable Paul Cosgrove, Secretary of State for Finance, announced that CDIC coverage of deposits would be increased from \$20,000 to \$60,000 effective as of that date. To parallel this, I announced on January 19 that the deposit insurance applicable to credit unions and caisses populaires would be increased to \$60,000 effective as of that day.

The federal bill, C-142, was introduced in the House of Commons on February 19 and received third reading on April 14. It is now awaiting approval by the Senate and royal assent. When this bill becomes law, depositors who have matured deposits in excess of \$20,000 in Seaway Trust or Greymac Trust that they have not been able to withdraw because of the \$20,000 limitation will then be able to withdraw up to \$60,000.

Following the actions of the registrar to take control of the three trust companies, it was confirmed that deposits taken in by the trust companies from the public had been used in what appeared to be a very large number of questionable investments which disregarded the limitation to 75 per cent of value in respect of

mortgages. It did not appear that it was appropriate to return the administration of these companies back to the controlling shareholders, nor did it seem appropriate, particularly in the case of Crown Trust, to take an alternative course of action provided by the Loan and Trust Corporations Act to initiate proceedings to wind up the companies. Such action would have reduced asset recoveries and resulted in losses to uninsured depositors and delays and uncertainties to all depositors.

This was particularly so in the case of Crown Trust because that company, unlike the other two, was carrying on a profitable and therefore valuable trust business. However, it was a wasting asset in the sense that public disclosure of the financial condition of the company and of the questionable investment practices of its management was resulting in trust accounts and agency business being removed from the company.

After careful consideration of the situation and in co-operation with the CDIC, which had agreed to provide financing, it was determined that the course of action that would result in the greatest recovery of assets of Crown Trust was one that would see the company taken over as a going concern by a responsible trust company. This course of action, which promised the greatest return for depositors, shareholders, creditors and others, was not possible under the then existing legislation. We therefore decided to seek legislative approval to dispose of the assets of Crown Trust. As members will recall, this resulted in the introduction on January 24 of the Crown Trust Company Act, 1983.

In order to make the acquisition of Crown Trust assets at all attractive, it was necessary to guarantee prospective bidders that if they took over the company, they would not immediately become embroiled in litigation. This required that the new act preclude any legal actions to set aside any agreements made in respect of the disposition of the assets of Crown Trust.

I note that while it was necessary to enact the Crown Trust Company Act to protect the interest of depositors, the recourse of shareholders to the courts for any losses caused by improper or imprudent behaviour by the registrar or his agents was fully preserved.

2:20 p.m.

On January 25 I made a further statement to this House commenting on the need for speedy passage of the Crown Trust Company Act. At that time extracts from the Woods Gordon report submitted on January 15 were tabled. At

the same time information was given on how the \$152 million advanced by the trust companies had been distributed. Further information on the distribution of these funds has recently come to light in the report of Coopers and Lybrand, the court-appointed receiver of Greymac Credit, and that information is included in the materials being tabled today.

This House was also advised that none of the lawyers acting for any of the parties involved in any of the transactions of sale, resale and mortgage of the rental units appeared to have actually dealt with the \$125 million that was stated to have been paid by the numbered companies.

On January 27 I made a further statement to the House explaining the need and import of that bill. At that time I dealt with an issue that is still raised and is clearly not understood by some. I refer to the question, "Why have no criminal charges been laid?"

The taking of deposits from the public by a trust company is not a right but a privilege that is granted by this Legislature through the provisions of the Loan and Trust Corporations Act. When those privileges are abused in a manner that puts in jeopardy depositors and those who provide the insurance and premiums to protect them, we have a duty to act. That action could not and should not await the outcome of any criminal investigation.

On January 31, before the administration of justice committee, which was considering the Crown Trust bill, I explained at length the significance of a trust company having a proper borrowing base and how the mortgages on the Cadillac Fairview rental units and another very significant mortgage transaction were both capable on their own of eliminating the borrowing base of Crown Trust and thereby preventing it from accepting any further public deposits. The bill was passed and received royal assent on February 1.

As members are aware, the operations of Crown Trust are now largely in the hands of Central Trust. There remain under the control of the registrar a number of assets of uncertain value, which we have characterized as soft assets. Major among these are the mortgage loans made on the Cadillac Fairview rental units in the amount of \$63 million and a mortgage loan made in respect of real estate in Vancouver in the amount of about \$50 million.

At the time Woods Gordon reported on Crown Trust it was not clear how matters would develop. With the arrangements made with

Central Trust, the role of Woods Gordon has significantly changed, and I have now been advised that, with the exception of subsequent reports on soft assets, they do not intend to submit any further reports on the affairs of Crown Trust.

I have already tabled the Woods Gordon report of January 15 on Crown Trust. I am tabling today reports of Touche Ross on the affairs of Greymac Trust and Seaway Trust. From these reports the members will be able to see the extensive nature of this assignment and the difficulties encountered. It is clear that, had the government not taken this action on January 7, the problems uncovered and referred to in these reports would have been aggravated beyond their present state. Those whose funds were on deposit with the three trust companies and any who might have placed their savings with those trust companies would have faced greater risk of loss had the government not acted. The losses to the CDIC, which potentially are in excess of \$100 million, would also have been even greater if the government had not acted.

These reports indicate that the Cadillac Fairview transaction was only part of an overall pattern of behaviour. I expect that the precise analysis of that behaviour will be a central element of the final Morrison report when it is available and will be a matter for a decision in the courts. In the meantime, it may assist the Legislature in its understanding of the situation if I refer to an affidavit filed in court by my adviser, Mr. John L. Biddell, where he states as follows:

"Investigations conducted into the affairs of the plaintiffs since January 7, 1983, suggest that the Cadillac transaction was not an isolated example of the improper use of the moneys of the respective plaintiffs with the object of securing immediate profits to those responsible for the management of the plaintiffs' affairs. On the contrary, it appears that the Cadillac transaction was just one of a number of similar transactions involving initially Seaway and Greymac Trust before Greymac Credit purchased control of Crown, and since that purchase all three of the plaintiffs. A number of such transactions appear to show a systematic misuse of the plaintiffs' moneys.

"The transactions to which reference is made in the previous paragraph ('the relevant transactions') all have a common involvement between one or more plaintiffs and companies controlled by or associated with Rosenberg and Player or one or other of them. During 1981 and 1982 the

relevant transactions comprised a substantial part of the respective businesses of Seaway and its wholly owned subsidiaries ('the Seaway group'), and of Greymac Trust and its wholly owned subsidiaries for the time ('the Greymac Trust group'). During the period between October 7, 1982 (when Greymac Credit acquired control of Crown), and December 8, 1982, Crown became involved in the relevant transactions as hereinafter appears.

"The relevant transactions involve one or other or both of the following two elements:

"(a) An artificially inflated rise in the apparent value of the property concerned secured by a purchase on the open market and an immediate resale to parties within or associated with either the Seaway group or the Greymac Trust group, and the application of such profit in the increase in the equity base of one or other of the plaintiffs, thereby increasing the statutory limit on the amount of money the relevant plaintiff could borrow from the general public. I hereinafter call this element 'the self-fuelling element.' The self-fuelling element progressively gave increasing scope for the application of the plaintiffs' money in the second element in the relevant transactions, namely:

"(b) An advance of the plaintiffs' money to complete the relevant transactions so that on such completion such money or a substantial portion thereof was paid either directly or indirectly in some form or other to Player or Rosenberg or some associate of theirs. The said advance of the plaintiffs' money was made on the basis that the property concerned had a value at least as high as the subsale price and that such property was a proper security for the advance. As will hereafter appear, in most cases no or no proper appraisal was made of the value of the relevant property before the plaintiffs' money was advanced and no proper inquiries were made as to the financial standing of the borrower and no proper steps were taken to ensure the protection of the plaintiffs."

The registrar has instructed counsel to initiate certain lawsuits against those companies and individuals believed to be central to this scheme in an effort to trace and recover all moneys improperly paid out and to seek damages against corporations and individuals who may be found by the courts to have participated in an unlawful activity.

As recently as yesterday, proceedings in the Grand Court of the Cayman Islands resulted in a broad order which I am tabling in this House together with all the materials filed in those

proceedings and in support of them. Counsel for the registrar in those proceedings in the Cayman Islands hopes we will be able to trace and recover any funds located in that jurisdiction which properly belong to the three trust companies.

In addition, there are numerous court proceedings under way seeking to compel various law firms that have direct knowledge of the dealings by the three trust companies and other related companies to divulge any information they may have pertaining to these matters. In fairness to some of the lawyers who have resisted disclosure, it should be stated that they may have been precluded from co-operating with the registrar and the Morrison inquiry by their clients claiming solicitor-client privilege. The validity of this claim of privilege is currently before the courts and until this issue is finally resolved some of the information needed to explain many of these transactions may be unavailable to the authorities.

2:30 p.m.

Notwithstanding these difficulties, various actions have been instituted for the tracing of moneys said to belong to the three trust companies, and in a number of instances the courts have granted interim orders freezing funds and assets until all these issues can be finally adjudicated upon. Because many of these matters are at present before the courts and more lawsuits are contemplated, I do not propose to comment on them. I do, however, wish to make it clear that both CDIC and this government are committed to ensure that every effort will be made to seek appropriate recovery for all the losses that the public has been made to suffer.

With respect to the future of Seaway Trust and Greymac Trust, documents I am tabling today are quite lengthy and complex, but I wish to share the highlights of those reports with the members of the Legislature.

The Seaway Trust report confirms that after making appropriate provision against many of Seaway's assets, there is an indicated deficiency in assets in the amount of \$75 million. That is, the company not only has no borrowing base for the purposes of section 118 of the Loan and Trust Corporations Act, but it is also in a negative position with respect to its net assets.

The Seaway report also gives many examples of questionable practices in establishing value for lending purposes, many of which relate to the now all-too-familiar pattern of chain or flip transactions among related parties with rapid and substantial escalation of property pricing.

This served to remove trust company funds as loans at the expense and risk of Seaway's depositors.

Touche Ross also reports that certain of the Seaway transactions appear to have been entered into more for the benefit of its controlling shareholder or its officers than for Seaway itself as a deposit-taking institution. The report also suggests that the apparent disregard of Seaway management of the growing dependence of Seaway on the financial capacity of Kilderkin raises at least an inference that Seaway may be in some manner controlled by William Player.

The Greymac Trust Company report by Touche Ross indicates a deficiency in assets of \$62 million after making appropriate provisions against many of its assets. As is the case with Seaway Trust, this means that Greymac Trust not only has no borrowing base for the purposes of section 118 of the Loan and Trust Corporations Act, but has a deficit with respect to its net assets.

Touche Ross reports that some of the transactions which the principals of Greymac Trust authorized were so complex as to raise the inference that the complexity was intended either to circumvent regulatory requirements or to cloud the underlying values of the properties involved, or both. Examples are given in the report that illustrate the close working relationship which existed between the Greymac group of companies and Mr. Player.

The report on Greymac Trust also describes Mr. Rosenberg's interest in and growing ownership of the Canadian Commercial Bank, a chartered bank established under the Bank Act of Canada. The Greymac Trust report indicates that through a series of transactions commencing in 1982 Mr. Rosenberg arranged for the Greymac, Seaway and Player groups of companies to purchase 27 per cent of that chartered bank. The bank has announced that it has refused to register the transfer of shares purchased by Crown Trust, Greymac Trust and Seaway Mortgage, stating that if these companies are associated within the meaning of the Bank Act, it would contravene the statutory 10 per cent limitation of individual equity ownership in a chartered bank.

The Touche Ross report states that from correspondence on file at Greymac Trust it appears that Mr. Rosenberg planned to acquire 100 per cent of the shares of the Canadian Commercial Bank, and Touche Ross concludes that this was for the purpose of extending the interest and influence of the shareholders and

senior officers of Greymac Trust and Seaway Trust into areas that would give them access to even more public deposit funds.

The review of the affairs of the trust companies on behalf of the registrar also indicated that Kilderkin Investments Ltd. was substantially indebted, directly or indirectly, to Seaway Trust and Greymac Trust and that payment of interest on such borrowing was significantly in arrears. This indebtedness and default was in respect of numerous transactions separate and apart from the Cadillac Fairview transaction and led to numerous foreclosure actions and considerable confusion among the tenants.

On February 15, Seaway Trust and Greymac Trust commenced action against Kilderkin to recover their loans. In the course of that action, the court appointed the Clarkson Co. interim receiver and manager of Kilderkin and authorized it to collect the rents from the 5,600 tenants in the buildings Kilderkin was obliged to manage.

In its report to the court on March 29, the Clarkson Co. reported that in its view Kilderkin had not been in a financial position to meet its liabilities for some time prior to its appointment and that Kilderkin was only able to continue in operation by virtue of obtaining ever-increasing sums of money on new property transactions involving funds from the Seaway and Greymac groups of companies.

That report sets out in detail examples of how funds were obtained from the trust companies and applied to the purchase or management of buildings that had in many cases been sold in chain transactions involving Kilderkin, the trust companies and their principals and affiliates at ever-increasing prices. The report also describes how large sums of money were transferred outside the jurisdiction to the Cayman Islands and other places without any backup documentation or justification.

Indeed, millions of dollars appear to have been paid out by Kilderkin on the basis of only a cheque requisition or a telephone call. This is typical of the business operations of the company where documentation for multi-million-dollar transactions, including the Cadillac Fairview transaction, ranges from sparse to nonexistent.

This situation has been worsened by lawyers who acted for Kilderkin on these transactions refusing to provide reporting letters and other documentation to the interim receiver. The interim receiver has determined that Mr. Player is personally indebted to Kilderkin in the amount

of \$10.5 million with no indication of his ability or intention to repay it.

The receiver has also noted that there was no overall direction in the financial management of Kilderkin and the cash-flow forecasts for many of the management projects undertaken by Kilderkin, including Cadillac Fairview, were simply not available. On the best available information, the Clarkson Co. estimated that Kilderkin would incur a loss of \$10.5 million for its financial year ending April 30, 1983.

I would remind the Legislature that Kilderkin was a central figure in the Cadillac Fairview transaction where it specifically agreed to underwrite millions of dollars of cash-flow deficiencies from the Cadillac Fairview buildings, which agreement was said to justify the stated purchase price of \$500 million.

I now turn to some other related matters.

First, I should say that discussions have taken place with representatives of the numbered companies with a view to possible settlement of existing lawsuits against them and parties related to them. I am advised that those discussions are still under way and I do not therefore propose to comment on them at this time. Contrary to media reports, these discussions are not in respect of any resale of the Cadillac Fairview buildings to the numbered companies, which are still the registered owners of those properties.

Second, I would like to comment on the story that William Player has found another buyer prepared to pay \$500 million plus for the buildings. Let me state most emphatically that no such offer has been produced by Mr. Player. It appears that he had some discussions with the Reliance Group of New York and that they displayed possible interest in the proposal as it was described to them by Mr. Player.

Certain lawyers appeared in Toronto last week, apparently on behalf of the Reliance Group. It now appears that they were here at the request of Mr. Player to promote a deal that might be sold to the Reliance Group. The Reliance Group has advised us that the New York lawyers who came to Toronto last week did not represent them.

It would appear that what Mr. Player offered for sale was the Cadillac Fairview buildings with some guaranteed rental income stream that was sufficient to justify the selling price he quoted. Needless to say, the registrar and this government totally reject any proposed solution to the improper borrowing from the three trust companies that places the burden of the solution on

tenants through government guarantees of rental levels outside the rent review process.

Third, I expect that Mr. Morrison's report will add to our understanding of what has gone on. His job has been a large and complex one. He has faced delays in reporting to me as a result of the failure of some individuals to extend to him their full co-operation.

I want to thank many others who have voluntarily come forward and assisted him in his inquiries. I am advised that Mr. Morrison's work is nearing completion and I expect to have his report in hand by the end of May. I have already undertaken to table that report in the House and to make it available to the Thom commission.

2:40 p.m.

As I have said, I have instructed my officials to prepare a white paper on the regulation of loan and trust corporations in this province. As Mr. Morrison's report will doubtless contain relevant information in this regard, I intend to allow one month after delivery of that report for delivery of the white paper. It ought to be released in June.

I would also like to make some observations about how we are likely to approach the white paper and any changes in the administrative procedures concerning financial institutions in Ontario.

First, we are reassured that the loan and trust industry as a whole in Ontario truly deserves the high degree of confidence placed in the industry by the public. Indeed, if anything, loan and trust companies in Ontario, with very limited exceptions, have not altered their long-standing prudent approach to mortgage lending and other investments and in this respect may have actually conducted their business in a more conservative and secure fashion than many other participants in the financial system. This means that we do not propose to overreact to a situation which I believe the Morrison report will make clear was a very particular situation.

Second, new powers were granted to the registrar and cabinet by the legislation of December 21 last. These powers, together with changes in administrative procedures which take into account the lessons of the present affair and general changes in the economy and financial system, will, I believe, go a long way to ensure that we will not see a repetition of our problems with these trust companies.

Mr. Kerrio: What about Re-Mor and Astra? What are you talking about?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: I cannot hear you. Speak up a little bit.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Finally, our response to the need for new legislation and different administration procedures will build on these two elements, while minimizing changes which would make the practical position of those running their business in a sound and prudent manner more burdensome or restrictive in any material and unnecessary way.

I would be remiss if I did not mention the excellent co-operation and assistance we have received from CDIC. As I have explained on previous occasions, the arrangements for the continued operations of the trust companies were only possible because CDIC provided backup financing that enabled the companies to meet their obligations on maturing deposits. These arrangements are an essential element in the Crown Trust management by Central Trust and will be essential in any arrangements for the management of Seaway Trust and Greymac Trust.

To give you some idea of the scope of the CDIC involvement, I would like to provide the House with the following information on the net amount of advances made to date by CDIC even after some recoveries to the three trust companies: Crown Trust, \$80 million; Seaway Trust, \$33.5 million; Greymac Trust, \$7.5 million. The advances to Seaway and Greymac will increase in the near future. That will be so even if we are able to make alternative arrangements for their future operations.

I would remind the members that payments made by CDIC under its obligation to insure deposits become a claim against the assets of the trust companies that is payable before there can be any distribution of surplus assets to preferred or common shareholders.

The practical and effective co-operation of the federal government, through the Honourable Paul Cosgrove in getting the insurance limit increased to \$60,000 and through the arrangements made by CDIC in respect of the three companies and our own government, is an excellent demonstration to the public of how our two levels of government can work together to achieve positive result in the public interest.

We are working very hard to complete negotiations which would lead to the transfer of the operations of Seaway Trust and Greymac Trust to other institutions. We contemplate agreements similar to the Central Trust agreement

with respect to Crown Trust. If such arrangements can be achieved, this would hopefully lead to seeing arm's-length depositors paid in full as their certificates mature.

I would like to conclude with some observations. First and foremost, we have endeavoured to act in a manner which contributed to the stability and soundness of the financial system as a whole so that the public would be justified in continuing to place its confidence in it and its participants. We have sought to protect depositors and achieve maximum recoveries for the three trust companies and their depositors. We are determined to ensure the loan and trust industry is one in which there can be public confidence based on a balance between reliance on laws and regulatory administration on the one hand, and on market forces and private sector responsibility on the other.

Finally, it has been my determination throughout to make as full disclosure as possible as soon as possible. I have felt subject to four major disclosure constraints which I would like to outline.

Obviously, my first constraint was to avoid saying or doing anything which might create unnecessary public uncertainty or a lack of confidence in the financial system or any of its members.

Second, I have been constrained in that at any given time I may not have had all the relevant information necessary to make public statements.

I have also sought to avoid jeopardizing depositors through untimely disclosures which might damage possibilities for recoveries and the preservation of the business of the trust companies.

Finally, relating to matters which are either before the courts or properly subject to the courts, I have felt that, to the extent possible, information should come forward under the protection available to all parties from the courts.

The protection of depositors dictates firm action on the part of government, and that is what is taking place.

VISITOR

Mr. Speaker: I would ask all honourable members to join with me in welcoming and recognizing Mr. Dov Shilansky who is a member of the parliament of Israel. I am also advised he is the parliamentary deputy to the Prime Minister of Israel.

USE OF TIME IN QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Speaker: Just before proceeding with the most interesting part of the day, I would like to ask the consideration and co-operation of all honourable members. In my opinion, there seems to be a growing tendency to usurp more time than is justified in question period by the insistence of some members on asking more than one question at the same time, referring to them as three-, four-, five- and six-part questions. This, in turn, leads to exceptionally long answers which are often an abuse of question period as the minister tends to go even further in his answer than the multiple questions warrant and perhaps elaborate more than necessary.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Will the member for Sudbury East (Mr. Martel) just listen? I am asking for the co-operation of all honourable members by keeping their questions to a single, specific question which may be answered by a specific answer, as is the obvious intent of the standing orders. This will enable more members to participate in question period. Therefore, I will henceforward rule multiple questions and multiple answers out of order.

ORAL QUESTIONS

SALE OF RENTAL UNITS

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations. As one attempts to sort through the plethora of material he has supplied to us, there is one recurring theme that comes back all through his statement and the reports we have read. This has turned out to be the greatest regulatory boondoggle in the history of this province.

I refer the minister to page 7 of the Touche Ross report on Seaway Trust which says, "The files relating to mortgage loans are lacking in data, including appraisals, financial information on borrowers, etc., which would normally form the basis for the prudent lending of deposit moneys."

I refer to the Touche Ross report on Greymac, and I quote from page 15, "The management philosophy appears to have been closer to that of a speculator or gambler rather than the prudent regard required for the investment and safeguarding of depositors' funds."

It is obvious, is it not, that this boondoggle, this mess, has been going on for some considerable period of time—indeed, two years before

the great Cadillac Fairview transaction? How could that possibly have happened when the government has a team of regulators who are supposed to prevent this from happening?

2:50 p.m.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, I assume that the initial comment about a plethora of material was not meant as a criticism, because in his endeavours to be on all sides of all issues the Leader of the Opposition has continually criticized me for not submitting information. Let me say that he has plenty of information, the Legislature now has plenty of information and the public will surely have good confirmation of the steps this government has taken to protect the depositors of this province.

Mr. Speaker: And now to the question, please.

Mr. Sweeney: Just answer the question.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: The Leader of the Opposition knows very well, and we have talked about this many times in this House before, that the issue with respect to the business practices and the activities of the trust companies in question is under thorough and complete review under section 152 of the Loan and Trust Corporations Act by Mr. Morrison.

I have also indicated very clearly that an internal review is going on, which may result in an external review. The combination of that information will present to this House a very full and complete story of what has taken place, and it is going to take place when that information is available.

Mr. Peterson: Obviously, the issue here is regulatory failure, that the minister should have known what was going on. He was aware, I am sure, that Seaway Trust was in front of the cabinet twice in 1982 for regulatory approval, and as I understand it, never once was there an objection to the way it ran its companies then.

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

Mr. Peterson: That, I am sure, he is aware of. Who is conducting the internal review of the failure of the regulation system?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: First of all, the honourable member's statement that there were never any questions asked of the companies involved is a mere assumption on his part. I assume he is interested in the actual story, which will be forthcoming, because we are going to know the full story and it is going to be told in the context of what has been going on and in the context of the Morrison report.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: I would like to know from the minister in answer to this question, why he met privately with the three publishers without the press being there—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Sargent: That is important to what he is saying now.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Your leader has asked his question.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: I do not agree with the initial assumption of the Leader of the Opposition. Again, I only re-emphasize that the details of the internal investigation, which may require an external investigation, will be made known when it is completed and when the Morrison report has also been completed. It is being carried out at the present time by a representative of our policy and priorities branch in conjunction with a member of the administration and finance division.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, can the minister disclose to us now who the principals are behind the numbered companies that are the registered owners of the Cadillac properties?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, the situation with respect to the ownership of the numbered companies remains the same as it was when this House prorogued in February. The honourable member understands that quite well and understands the problems related to it.

Mr. Peterson: Given the major failure of the ministry to spot what was going on for two years; given the fact that there were warning signals; given the fact that we had a little company like Seaway going from \$1.2 million in assets in 1978 to \$300 million in 1982; given the fact that they were before the cabinet; given the fact that they were on intermittent or monthly licence and then Greymac was switched, for example, in October 1982 to a yearly licence, obviously giving passive if not active approval to what it was doing, how can the minister have any faith that those regulators or the people who are giving him advice are on top of the situation as it took place here, let alone with other trust companies in existence right now?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: I can only reiterate that I trust that the Leader of the Opposition, along with all members, would be interested in the whole story, and it is the whole story that will be reported.

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, I want to ask a new question of the minister with respect to the apartment buildings. It is my understanding that he has launched legal action against every bank in Grand Cayman, trying to trace down \$109 million. I would like him to confirm or deny whether that is the case in the affidavits and the variety of documents he filed yesterday, the day before and possibly today. If it is the case, does it confirm, in the minister's judgement, the existence of that money? Does it say the Arabs exist and there was an arm's-length transaction? Does it say the buildings were sold for \$500 million and thereby confirm the value?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, which question do I have permission to answer?

Mr. Speaker: Any one.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Any one or all, my choice? I may confirm then that a writ called a Mareva writ was issued in the Cayman Islands on behalf of the trust companies against all the parties, including the numbered companies, with respect to any moneys in the possession of those banks, be it the so-called \$109 million that was said to be advanced or be it any other moneys, such as the money that Mr. Player indicated last week was in an account on his behalf in the Cayman Islands.

Mr. Peterson: On that subject, can the minister confirm at this point that the Arab transaction was a legitimate arm's-length transaction and that they were in a position to buy those buildings? Is the minister now categorically denying that the Reliance Group offer is not an offer, but is a mere speculation on the part of Mr. Player, and that we still do not know who owns those buildings or where they are going to end up?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Again, with respect, I think the member is asking a question about the initial so-called transaction or payment of \$125 million, a question that still remains in some degree of doubt. Certainly, the interim reports of Mr. Morrison that the member now has before him will indicate that Mr. Morrison has some doubts about it.

Whether it took place, it has been said before Mr. Morrison that it did take place and that there is money in the Cayman Islands and, therefore, the registrar, on behalf of the trust companies and the depositors of this province, has an obligation to proceed on the basis of that statement. In addition to that, there have been statements with respect to other moneys deposited in the Cayman Islands.

With respect to the Reliance Group, what I am saying is that there have been no Reliance representatives in Toronto. There have been no documents forwarded. There have been no offers made, and the only parties that attended in the city and met with Woods Gordon, it now turns out, were representatives acting on behalf of Mr. William Player.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, if the minister will not tell us who the principals are behind the numbered companies that are the registered owners of the apartment buildings, will he give us specifically the names of the representatives of those principals and those numbered companies with whom he is carrying on discussions or negotiations?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: I do not think it is any secret that Mr. Qutub of Saudi Arabia has been the official representative of the reported Saudi Arabian investors. That has been made very clear.

Mr. Peterson: Has the minister determined whether there was an arm's-length sale to the so-called Saudi Arabian investors at a valuation of \$500 million? That is the key to the whole question of whether there were soft assets in the various trust companies. Is the minister still hanging on to his opinion that they are only worth \$300 million and, thereby, they were soft assets jeopardizing the deposits in the trust companies? Is that still the essential dilemma in his view?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: This government and this ministry have no dilemma. It has been very clearly put what our view is with respect to the value of those properties. That remains unchanged.

STRIKEBREAKING LEGISLATION

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Labour and it concerns the statement he made today as well as the general question of strikebreaking legislation. On pages 3 and 4 of his statement the minister says it would be unfair to both the government and to Mr. Dougdeen's family and friends, who must be suffering grievously, to suggest that his death resulted from deficiencies in the law.

Would the minister agree that if we had legislation in Ontario that gave to the Ontario Labour Relations Board clear carriage of the conduct of a strike and of a picket line and clear legislation that restricted the movement of goods in and out of a struck plant it is very likely that Mr. Dougdeen's death would never have

occurred and certainly likely that no such incident would ever be repeated in this province?

3 p.m.

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, I cannot agree with my learned friend in the statement or question that he just put. I can only repeat my earlier comments in respect to the other two provinces that have some sort of legislation in place, that the tragic accident would still have occurred had we had in place in Ontario either or both pieces of legislation that are in place in British Columbia and in Quebec.

Mr. Rae: What we are suggesting to the minister is that Ontario be a leader and if there are deficiencies in the legislation in BC and Quebec they need not be repeated in Ontario.

I would like to specifically ask the minister, given the absence of the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry), whether he would not take up with the Attorney General the very serious situation which is taking place in the strike at the Central Precision plant in Rexdale. I am sure the minister is aware that the Securicor firm has gone before a justice of the peace in west Metro, Mr. Kashuba, and that as a result that gentleman has issued warrants for the arrest of several individuals. As the minister knows, it is a somewhat unusual practice, when a JP has been presented with a series of private charges, that rather than issuing a summons he has actually issued warrants for arrest.

Given the severity of that action taken by the justice of the peace in this situation and the dramatic contrast between the response of the authorities in this situation and the tragic events at the Alcan plant, would the minister consider taking up with the Attorney General the whole question of the way in which justice is administered on a picket line, and the very real hardship and tension and extraordinary deterioration in collective bargaining relationships which is taking place as a result of that kind of action?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: My first responsibility and concern as far as the circumstances at Central Precision are concerned is to mediate a settlement. In that respect we have had several meetings over the past couple of weeks. I personally have met with representatives of the union; they were accompanied by my colleague, the member for Hamilton East (Mr. Mackenzie). Since then I have had meetings with the management of Central Precision.

We have some new parties involved in the negotiations and we are anticipating a full-scale mediation effort on Friday of this week. I am

optimistic that the settlement of the resolution, of course, will settle the problems on the picket line.

Mr. Wrye: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary to the minister revolves around the general need for some kind of legislative action on his behalf in the area of strikebreaking, particularly as a result of some of the actions and the enormous tragedy at Alcan and some of the activities at Central Precision in recent weeks.

Does the minister not believe the time has come, as was suggested to him last week by the Ontario Federation of Labour, for him to put an end to professional strikebreaking in industry in this province? Does he not believe that legislation which is now in place in some states in the United States, such as Massachusetts and New York, would be useful in Ontario to bring to an end the abuses of many of these so-called security firms in labour relations situations?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, as the honourable member is aware, there is a matter of this nature before the Ontario Labour Relations Board at present and we are awaiting that decision. The member is also aware that the whole matter of security firms is being studied by the Solicitor General (Mr. G. W. Taylor) through the Ontario Provincial Police, and possible amendments to the appropriate act out of the Solicitor General's office are being considered.

As the member is also aware, there is access to the courts in these matters. There have been two very significant judgements in our courts in the last couple of years with respect to illegal action of this nature.

We are looking at all these various matters in concert with the representations made to us by Mr. Cliff Pilkey, president of the Ontario Federation of Labour, and his senior colleagues on Friday. I made a commitment earlier in question period that I would study matters from all sides in a very objective manner and I fully intend to do that.

Mr. Rae: The minister has responsibility not only for protecting collective bargaining rights, which we believe are being undermined today by the work of these security firms and by the strikebreaking activities of many employers, but also for human rights and the protection of human rights legislation in Ontario.

When the minister undertakes this review of strikebreaking legislation, will he consider the impact of any refusal on his part to move not only on labour relations and collective bargain-

ing but on the sense of fairness, justice and hope which many new Canadians have, and had prior to the kinds of events we have seen at Central Precision and Alcan? Will he take that into consideration when he considers the kind of legislation that is necessary?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: I will certainly take that into consideration. I would have done so without being lectured by the leader of the third party. I resent the implication that he and his colleagues are the only ones who are interested in a sense of fairness, a sense of hope, and so on.

Mr. Rae: The minister is very touchy.

WOMEN'S ISSUES MINISTERIAL APPOINTMENT

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, my second question is for the Premier. It concerns one of the few specific promises that was made in the speech from the throne yesterday. It said on page 13, "My government will move to name a senior minister who will be responsible for women's issues with a complete mandate to review, initiate, direct and promote policies favourable to and in support of women in Ontario society."

Are we talking about a senior minister who already has other responsibilities or about a minister whose sole job will be to promote the interests of women, and are we talking about a ministry which will have the ability to support that minister in his or her work?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I reply to the earlier admonition. I think there were three questions. I guess my simple answer, in order to meet the spirit of the Speaker's admonition, is that I will answer all three fairly soon.

Mr. Rae: With the absence of not only a fair reply but of any specific statements in the speech from the throne with respect to equal pay for work of equal value, affirmative action, skills training, child care or pensions, I would like to ask the Premier how he can justify the fact that statements made even in earlier throne speeches, for example, with respect to equal pay for work of equal value are not contained in this throne speech? How can he justify the omission of any specific measures that would provide for greater equality between men and women in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I do not think it is necessary to repeat some of those things. If we had done that, the honourable member would simply have asked me, "What did the Premier mean in the throne speech of a year ago?"

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, if the Premier is interested in advancing the cause of equality for women in this province, which is a laudable aim, why would he not show specific good faith in this matter by removing the government's veto of the child-rearing drop-out provision, which is affecting women all across this province and is a major sticking point in the great pension debate?

He is the only holdout. Why would he not show his personal bona fides in this matter by at the very least removing that veto so we can advance that cause?

3:10 p.m.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure that is a supplementary question but I will answer it anyway. This government has always been sympathetic to that particular point of view. We have made that clear on a number of occasions and have also indicated to the members of this House the reason that we have been reluctant to move because of other matters that were being discussed with the government of Canada. However, I can assure the honourable member it is a matter that we have addressed and are addressing very carefully.

Mr. Rae: In the throne speech yesterday we were told the minister would have "wide-ranging responsibility for taking steps to close the gap in wages, as well as the proportion of women who are clustered in particular areas of employment." Can the Premier simply tell us what steps he intends to take?

Hon. Mr. Davis: After the first question, in which the member suggested there were no specifics in the speech, I am delighted he has now found two. He will get the answer to those two specifics in due course.

NORCEN ENERGY RESOURCES LTD.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations. I am trying to understand the thought processes of the minister. On the one hand, with the trust companies and under the act that we passed before the session broke off in February, he proceeded to confiscate the property of certain companies, parcel it off, sell it off and prevent recourse to the courts, and yet there is apparently no evidence to lay any charges under any statute.

Yet in a decision just in the last week involving Norcen Energy Resources Ltd. and certain other individuals, he decided not to acquiesce or give his consent to a prosecution when he had reports from his own investigators, from the

Ontario Securities Commission, he had the police investigation which recommended charges—

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

Mr. Roy:—and he had recommendations and a suggestion by the chief law officer of the crown and the crown law officers to proceed with charges.

How is it, based on that particular evidence and on those recommendations, he decided to refuse to give consent or to allow the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry) to prosecute under the Securities Act?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, I apologize beforehand, but there will be some detail in the response to this question because it is fundamental and shows a lack of understanding of the Securities Act in this province.

First of all, let me say there was no confiscation. If the member would have chosen the alternative route, which caused a loss to everybody, then that is on his head and not mine. Second, the issue of whether or not there are criminal charges does not relate to the activities of this ministry and what it had to do. If he has a question in that regard, he knows where to put it.

Third, let us be very clear—and I do not say this with any disrespect, but just as a fact—I do not think he understands the true meaning of the Ontario securities legislation as it was established by this Legislature. That body was established, under section 2, to be entirely in control of the administration and activities with respect to the securities market in this province, and it was to maintain an independence and an arm's-length relationship to the ministry. That they have done and that they continue to do.

There have been no requests of me, either by the Ontario Securities Commission or by the Attorney General, to lay any charges. So his statement is out of order.

Mr. Roy: Does the minister deny that under the act, section 119, any prosecution under the securities legislation requires his consent? Does the minister deny he has refused to grant that consent over the wishes and the suggestions of his own securities officials? Considering that under section 125 of that act the limitation period was one year for bringing this matter before the courts, is the minister going to prohibit the commission from taking any proceedings as it can do under section 125, subsection 2, to bring this matter before the commission for

a full hearing and a full and complete airing of this whole matter?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Once again I think there is not a full understanding of the functioning of the legislation nor the functioning of the commission.

The commission, on its own, I believe following a series of three meetings and following discussions and meetings with the Attorney General's representatives, chose not to request my permission to proceed with a charge. They do not have to get my permission in that area to not lay a charge; they only have to get my permission, which then requires evaluation of the basis for it, if they wish to proceed with a charge.

So the member is totally in error in saying that I have refused to allow them to do this. They have unanimously felt that there were not sufficient grounds to justify their proceeding. That is their decision.

The Attorney General, in conversations and correspondence with me a week ago today, indicated that some of his crown law officers had a differing point of view and asked if, in the light of that, I would ask the commission to review its decision. This I did, enclosing a copy of his letter and, at the request of the Attorney General, allowing representatives of the crown to attend at that subsequent meeting of the commission. Remember that this was an administrative decision they were making, not a judicial one. As a result of that prolonged afternoon and evening meeting a week ago the commission again unanimously reaffirmed its decision not to ask me for permission to lay a charge.

So, with respect, I think the member has not got the process quite clear, and there has been no request made to me.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, my question also relates to the actions of the minister with respect to the Norcen Energy Resources Ltd. matter and the matters before the commission. It also relates to section 119. Why did the minister, in accordance with the terms of that section, not direct the commission to proceed in the matter for the following reasons.

One is that the investigators submitted to the commission a report with the following statement, "We are of the view that a strong case can and should be made in an appropriate forum that Norcen and certain of its individual officers broke the law by making false statements about, and omitting to disclose, an intention which constituted a material fact and decisions which

constituted material changes within the meaning of the act."

The minister knew that the chairman of the commission, whatever his bona fides with respect to his conflict of interest decision may have been, was at all material times a partner in the law firm that advised Norcen Energy Resources Ltd. during the period of the occurrences that were under investigation. Indeed, it was a partner in that firm who approached and intervened with the Attorney General of Ontario with respect to these matters.

Why did the minister not direct the commission under section 119 to proceed with the charges under the Securities Act?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, there are two very important elements to the question asked, and I accept the bona fides of the question because I understand the issues raised here.

First of all, I think the honourable member appreciates that these proceedings were at the administrative decision stage. The commission sitting as a whole body came to the conclusion that the recommendations of its investigative officers were not in line with its views with respect to the appropriateness and the justification of charges being laid as a result of those views.

What the member is really saying is that I should publicly say I have no faith and confidence in the Ontario Securities Commission—

Interjection.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Well, he has publicly praised some of the members and individuals in that commission.

And he is saying I did not accept their recommendation and chose to override them and evaluate administrative documents provided to them and therefore say that they were not capable of giving me the kind of advice and the securities industry the kind of advice that was required.

I really do not accept that. I think the member has raised something that I find very troublesome, this issue of the conflict, because he knows very well the kind of things that people give up in order to come into public life and the sacrifices they make.

Mr. Renwick: Oh, come on now. That does not override it at all.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: He knows very well that the chairman, of high esteem, competence and great regard, has severed his relationship totally

with that firm with no commitment or understanding that he will return.

3:20 p.m.

He has no relationship to it at all, was never in any way related to the Norcen brief in that company; sought advice from counsel with respect to any conflict he might have, and put that problem before his fellow commissioners who unanimously said he, in their opinion, should proceed to take part in the discussions. If that is a conflict, we will have problems forever in getting the kind of competence we wish in positions such as that in the securities commission.

Mr. Renwick: The very fact that the chairman had to ask an opinion of counsel indicates very clearly the conflict of interest which should have disqualified him in the minister's eyes and should have led to his instructions to that commission to proceed.

My supplementary question is, to what extent has the minister's action under section 119 intervened and prevented his colleague the Attorney General from proceeding with charges under the Securities Act if possible, and if not, under the Criminal Code?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: I am not aware that it has had any detrimental effect with respect to anything the Attorney General chose to do. As a matter of fact, the Deputy Attorney General was advised on Tuesday evening of the decision of the commission and at that time, had we wished and had the Attorney General wished, still could have put a request to me for permission to commence charges.

He feels, as I do, that the statute, the securities legislation in this province, particularly section 2, places, through the Legislature, the administration and the regulation of the securities industry in that commission. Nevertheless, the Attorney General still has an overriding obligation with respect to administration of justice and he has demonstrated his concern very capably.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, will the minister not understand that what my colleague and I are suggesting is not interference in the day-to-day affairs of the commission. Surely he will understand that when one has a report from one's own investigators—the investigators from the commission—

Hon. Mr. Elgie: I do not get it.

Mr. Roy: No, the minister did not get the report but he knew the commission did and he knew the police were investigating this. Surely when the minister gets a letter from the chief

law officer of the crown asking his permission to proceed with charges that the commission will not proceed with, why at that point would he not intervene as the minister, as he is authorized to do under the statute?

Considering all the possibilities, including the possible conflict of interest as mentioned by my colleague referring to the chairman, why at that point would he not acquiesce to the request of the chief law officer of the crown and allow him to prosecute or to proceed with charges under the Securities Act?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, I seem to be having difficulty getting a very clear message across. The first message is that the securities commission exists to administer and regulate the securities industry. It does not report to me nor submit its investigative officers' reports to me for my approval or comment before it makes administrative decisions; nor should it, nor would this House expect it to. It is inappropriate for the member for Ottawa East to suggest that.

Second, he is in error again in saying that the Attorney General requested permission to lay charges. There was no such request and I have said that twice already.

ASSISTANCE TO FARMERS

Mr. Riddell: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture and Food.

In view of the fact that this government's promises to farmers in this year's throne speech are nothing more than a reshuffle of last year's promises and continue to ignore the real financial problems facing our farmers, given that Ontario farmers continue to go bankrupt at the alarming rate of one every two and a half days and because of this government's lack of meaningful assistance find themselves in the same financial crisis today as they did last year, other than blaming the federal government for its alleged lack of co-operation with this government's programs, what solutions does the minister have to offer Ontario farmers, many of whom are postponing making decisions on spring planting to the last possible moment because they simply cannot predict the future stability of the agricultural industry? Considering the low commodity prices, the high input costs, the uncertain interest rates and the lack of a meaningful government policy, does the minister not feel this province desperately needs a focus, an agricultural strategy within which farmers can make long-term decisions, rather than relying on disjointed ad hoc programs?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, I would certainly agree with the honourable member there is a need for clear, concise policies. I have been minister now for going on 15 months and I would be interested to know what ideas he has over there. I have certainly not been one to reject out of hand any possibility that there might be an original idea in that party.

If we were to read Hansard from a year or so ago, the member stood in his place and at that time made the same assertions that people were unwilling to plant crops and that there were going to be thousands of acres left unplanted in 1982. All his pessimism came to naught. All his predictions were unfounded. In 1982, this government was able to assist well over 3,000 farmers to cope with the problems brought on by high interest rates, a policy of the member's party in Ottawa that has wrought havoc not just on agriculture but on every sector of the economy.

It has to be repeated that we put forward in 1982 and have carried forward into 1983 some very substantial policies and policy proposals that will make agriculture more secure, more stable, more predictable and more attractive, to keep the present investors, and by that I mean everybody involved in agriculture right from the producers through the processors through the retailers, and to make it more attractive for the future.

I am talking about the farm assistance program. I am talking about the beginning farmers program we are going to introduce. I am talking about our proposals for property tax reform, and I would be interested to hear the member's views on that. I am talking about our very substantial leadership role in this province and this ministry in establishing a new national income stabilization program, which the Liberals have done precious little to help us bring about.

Mr. Riddell: The minister says my assertions have come to naught. In view of the fact that his promise to introduce a young farmers credit program is a repetition of a promise made in last year's throne speech and budget that never materialized, will the minister assure us that this program will be made available to the young farmers this spring?

Will he provide us with some of the details of the perceived program, since he has had well over a year to work on it? Will he give us some of the details of that program? What are the eligibility requirements? Is it going to be a long-term financial assistance program? Is it going to be at low interest rates? Will the

minister give us some of the details of the program if he knows all about it?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: First of all, I can assure the member he will not qualify.

Second, in 1982, the member will recall, both here in this House and in countless meetings around the province, when asked about that matter I was very frank, very honest and very open with everyone involved. I pointed out that subsequent to the throne speech of 1982 we had formulated certain proposals which, like proposals from various other ministries, had to be held because of the significant increase in the deficit that came to light because of declining revenues in the late spring or early summer of 1982.

I know that as a Grit the member believes he can have it all ways. He can say to the people: "On one hand, we will give you everything you want. On the other hand, we will not increase taxes. We will decrease taxes and we will decrease deficits." That simply cannot be done.

Mr. Speaker: I do not think that was the question.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: The people see through that party's phinness. It has never been elected in 40 years.

Mr. Swart: Mr. Speaker, I presume the minister in his meetings with the banks and other financial institutions would have determined the situation with regard to farm mortgage loans in default this year compared to last year and would therefore know that in the Farm Credit Corp. alone the amount of default is 50 per cent higher across the nation than it was last year and 60 per cent higher in this province. Recognizing that, how can he justify the throne speech, which gives no additional assistance whatsoever to farmers who are in this serious situation?

3:30 p.m.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, obviously the honourable member was not listening, because in fact we are going to introduce a program for beginning farmers this year.

Let me just comment on the meetings I have had with the financial institutions. I indicated to members at about the time the House was wrapping up in February that I was going to meet with the financial institutions. I must say I have been very pleased with the results of those meetings because, contrary to the kind of pessimism that the members opposite like to spread about agriculture, I found in my meetings, particularly with the chartered banks, who are heavily involved in farm credit in this

province and in this country, that they continue to consider agriculture to be a very good investment. On the whole, rather than a decline in farm credit, I found that the banks were telling me they anticipated lending more money, that they are going to be more heavily involved in supporting the efforts of our producers and everybody involved in agribusiness in this province.

I am sorry. I know the member would like me to confirm his pessimism; I know he would like to see nothing but negative predictions. But I do not have that to give him today.

CLOSURE OF AUDIO LIBRARY

Mr. Allen: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Provincial Secretary for Social Development on a matter on which she and I have had some exchanges in the past.

In February of this year the Speaker of this House wrote a letter to the president of the Peterborough branch of the Ontario Secondary School Teachers' Federation in which he declared, "The Honourable Margaret Birch and the Honourable Bette Stephenson have both assured me that the audio library at Trent University will continue in operation with the support of the Ontario government," only to receive about a month later a communication from the Minister of Colleges and Universities (Miss Stephenson) in which she said she had not changed her position; she was still holding that Trent must "get the funding required from other educational institutions using the service." As we all know, that would bring that institution to an abrupt end.

Mr. Speaker: I presume you do have a question.

Mr. Allen: Yes, it is coming.

The provincial secretary's handling of the question has continued to be clouded in some contradiction. At least the mechanism to provide the service a week or so ago was so threatening to the Trent audio library's board that it went into emergency session last week while some papers were speculating that the institution would remain open.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I just point out to the honourable member, who has referred to me and the riding I have the honour to represent, that he has not had the opportunity of the latest information. Would you please place your question?

Mr. Allen: In view of the attempt by a student at McMaster University as late as last week to

place orders with the Trent audio library for a date after April 30, orders that were rejected, and since the Hamilton Council of Women delegation is coming this afternoon to this Legislature, will the provincial secretary please finally announce the fate of the audio library services and end the tortured course of the issue and the uncertainty in which post-secondary print-handicapped students have laboured for so long?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to respond to the honourable member's long question. In fact, he is well aware that a very positive resolution to this whole issue of the provision of Braille and audio materials to the print-handicapped post-secondary students has been resolved to the satisfaction of all of those who have provided services. It is anticipated that a very positive statement will be made in this House.

I just wish the member would discontinue trying to stir the pot by issuing press releases and by meeting with people to continue this discussion.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Allen: Mr. Speaker, I venture to suggest that if I had not tried to stir the pot it would not have boiled.

Will the Provincial Secretary for Social Development assure the Legislature that when she makes her announcement, and I hope it will be soon, it will (1) include permanent funding arrangements that will be of an ongoing nature; (2) provide for a direct service from the library to students and not a convoluted, time-consuming structure; (3) involve clients in the service in such a way as to assure them of participation in the activity; and (4), and I think this is most important, assure print-handicapped students that they are the responsibility of the Ministry of Colleges and Universities?

Mr. Speaker: I think that was a four-part question. I would direct the minister to answer the last part.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I would just say that of all the groups that are involved in the provision of these particular services to the students in our post-secondary institutions, Trent did hold out. We were able to reach a compromise, and I have received a letter from them today advising me that they are very happy with the solution we have arrived at and are delighted to proceed to develop a policy that is going to benefit all the post-secondary students across the province.

Mr. Van Horne: Mr. Speaker, as late as last Friday a student at the University of Western Ontario contacted my office. Apparently that student was not aware of what the provincial secretary has just revealed in this House.

Given that the number of students is not that large, I am wondering whether we might put them at ease by notifying them individually that this wonderful announcement will not be the announcement of another makeshift program but, rather, of something permanent they can rely on for the remainder of their days at the university, and so those who are coming along after them also will not have to worry from day to day whether they will have any assistance.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Mr. Speaker, I think I can assure the honourable member that this will be an ongoing, permanent arrangement to provide the very necessary equipment for the students to continue with their education.

CONSTITUTIONAL PROPERTY RIGHTS

Mr. Epp: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Premier with respect to property rights. Given that the Prime Minister has promised to pass legislation by June to enshrine property rights into the Constitution if agreement can be made with the official opposition in Ottawa, and given that a total of seven provinces must pass similar resolutions for such legislation to take effect under Canada's new Constitution, will the Premier commit the government of Ontario to support the resolution which I introduced into the Legislature last October and reintroduce today, will the Premier propose his own legislation, or does he plan to continue doing nothing, as he has done on this issue previously?

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Never mind the interjections, please.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I could not hear the member for Grey (Mr. McKessock).

Mr. Speaker: Never mind.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am doing my very best to abide by your very proper admonitions at the beginning of the question period today. I will reply very briefly to the honourable member by saying I think it is likely that I will have something to say on this very important issue on Thursday afternoon.

Mr. Epp: Given the fact that we have waited for some months now for some indication by the government that it will come forth with an announcement, why does the Premier have to

wait until Thursday afternoon to do it? Why can he not do it on April 19?

3:40 p.m.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I sometimes hear a little criticism from across the House that we prolong the statements. The minister had a very important and I think lengthy statement today. We did not want to usurp all the time. I just say to the member to be patient until Thursday. He is not going to go away and I am not going away. I will address this issue on Thursday.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I did not expect the Premier to move so quickly on the matter. I wonder whether on Thursday, in any remarks he might want to make about entrenching already well-protected property rights, he will include some statement with respect to protecting the right to economic security of large sections of the public in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I can only assume that the member for Riverdale is referring to his own economic security, and I know he would not want me to do that in the Constitution.

CLOSURE OF CHRYSLER PLANT

Mr. Cooke: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Industry and Trade. The statement was made in the throne speech yesterday that "Ontario has pursued discussions with the government of Canada and business and labour leaders to promote its revitalization and future development." That was in reference to the auto industry.

In this regard, what efforts has the minister made to secure the maintenance of the spring plant, a Chrysler operation in the city of Windsor, and to secure a car to be built in Windsor rather than relying on vans and van-wagons? If he is concerned about the revitalization of the auto industry, why does he defend Chrysler's decision to close the spring plant instead of attempting to keep it here and the jobs here?

Hon. Mr. Walker: Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that Chrysler is maintaining an employment level that far exceeds anything imagined a few years ago. Second, I am told the spring plant lost \$5 million a year. If a plant is losing \$5 million a year, one has to wonder whether that is going to continue. The third thing is that for the past two and a half years it has been known that the spring plant was going to close. The honourable member has known it.

Mr. Cooke: It is obvious why the United Auto Workers refuses to meet with this minister. He

does not have the facts and he does not attempt to get the facts. That plant is not losing \$5 million a year.

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

Mr. Cooke: What efforts has the minister made to secure the production of a car in Canada? Why has this government backed off on a commitment made by the former Minister of Industry and Trade that we wanted 100 per cent Canadian value added by foreign auto makers? In yesterday's throne speech the government backed off and now we are going for 65 per cent, which is part of the Canada-US auto pact. Why are we willing to settle for 65 per cent now when it was 100 per cent a year ago?

Hon. Mr. Walker: The member himself knows we have arrived at a figure that is a reasonably accepted compromise with the entire industry.

Mr. Wrye: Mr. Speaker, to go back to the spring plant and the minister's claim that the plant is losing some \$5 million a year, that is the third or fourth time the minister has made that claim. I would like to know on what basis is he making that claim. Quite frankly, the facts we have are entirely different. If he is so concerned about revitalizing the industry, why does he not protect the spring plant and why did he allow Chrysler to back out of the research and development facility which would have revitalized another segment of the auto industry in Windsor?

Hon. Mr. Walker: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the claim of the \$5-million loss, I understand that is documented in Ottawa in terms of the auto pact understanding and it has been provided to me by Chrysler officials. I indicated a moment ago that I was told those were the figures. I have not conducted an audit to determine whether it is \$5 million, but I am told that is the case. I am told it is not refuted, and that is the situation. That is the first bit of information.

Relative to the R and D centre, the option was theirs to pick up that part of it. We had no hold over them as to whether they would or not. It was up to them to take down any of the money. Chrysler Canada chose not to take down any of the money that had been set aside for the purpose of the R and D facility. That was their choice. It was not our obligation.

ONTARIO YOUTH EMPLOYMENT

Mr. Sweeney: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing. My question refers to a news release from

the minister's office, dated March 24 and concerning Ontario youth employment programs.

Given that youth unemployment in Ontario has increased over the past year by 50,000 to a new high of 233,000 and has increased from 17.3 per cent to 22.2 per cent in that age group, can the minister explain why in that release he is announcing a reduction in provincial support to the Ontario youth employment program from last year's \$34 million to this year's \$23.7 million and from serving 57,000 young people last year to only 41,000 this year, a reduction of 16,000? It does not seem to make sense.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member will recall that also in the past year we brought in a program to try to develop some youth employment programs during the other months of the year. Indeed, that had to be redistributed from the youth program we had in past summers.

The member will recall also that in the press release we said very clearly, and the speech from the throne yesterday repeated it again, that while the government has added some opportunities for encouraging people to employ young people, the responsibility should not fall entirely to the government; the private sector should become more of a participant at this particular time and indeed was given the opportunity to do so.

Mr. Sweeney: The minister is surely aware that the private sector, this summer in particular, is going to have almost no job openings because its first responsibility is to hire back those who have been laid off.

Is the minister aware that a program operated by his colleague the member for Scarborough East (Mrs. Birch), the summer Experience '83 program, is going to provide service to 300 fewer young people this summer than there were last summer?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Yes, I am aware.

JOB TRANSFERS

Mr. Laughren: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Natural Resources. Can the minister tell us how he justifies his decision to close the sign shop at the Ministry of Natural Resources facilities in Huntsville and transfer the four jobs there to inmates at the Mimico reformatory?

Hon. Mr. Pope: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member wrote to me about this before; I cannot recall my response, but I will get it to him.

Mr. Speaker: The time for oral questions has expired.

Before I recognize the member for Ottawa East (Mr. Roy), I would like to thank all the honourable members for their co-operation. We are a little rough around the edges, but I am sure we are going to make it work.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege: You know how critical I am sometimes about the proceedings in the House, but I just want to comment that the admonition seems to have had a very positive effect. I am especially impressed—and I do not say this very often—by the shortness and brevity of the nonanswers from that side.

Mr. Speaker: That is hardly a point of privilege.

Mr. Wrye: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege, perhaps as a reminder to the Minister of Labour. On February 9, in answer to a question I asked him regarding the closing of Dylex's Lakeshore operation in Toronto, the minister said I should have a complete report on it in the very near future. He was not able to get that before the end of the last session.

Mr. Speaker: I am sure the minister has taken note of your nonpoint of privilege or nonpoint of order and will respond quickly.

3:50 p.m.

PETITIONS

CLOSURE OF FACILITIES FOR MENTALLY RETARDED

Mr. Sheppard: Mr. Speaker, I have a petition here with more than 7,000 names on it which I would like to present to the Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Drea) in regard to the closing of D'Arcy Place.

FEES FOR PROVINCIAL PARKS

Mr. T. P. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I too have a petition, which reads as follows:

"We, the undersigned, request a revision of the new legislation governing all Ontario provincial parks, re Ontario senior citizens. We should not be charged the \$8 a night weekend fees. We feel that Ontario seniors should have free overnight privileges to these parks year round as we did in the past."

It is signed by approximately 150 senior citizens from the Rainy River area.

Hon. Mr. Pope: Mr. Speaker, just to clarify the record: Senior citizens do in fact get free use of all areas in the parks on all weekdays during the regular park season. They also have access

to the campsites at regular fees during the weekends.

Interjections.

MOTIONS

HOUSE SITTINGS

Hon. Mr. Wells moved that commencing tomorrow, April 20, the House will not sit in the chambers on Wednesdays unless otherwise ordered.

Motion agreed to.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Hon. Mr. Wells moved that the first day for consideration of private members' public business be on the first Thursday following the completion of the debate on the address in reply to the speech from the throne and that in accordance with the order of the House of February 23, 1983, the order of precedence established in the first session and as amended from time to time be continued in the third session.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Wells moved that, due to the interruption of the consideration of private bill legislation occasioned by the prorogation of the second session of the 32nd parliament, application for private legislation relating to Bills Pr8, Pr9, Pr13, Pr20, Pr34 and Pr36, which received first reading in the second session, be considered during the present session without publishing further notice of the applications and without lodging further declarations proving publication, and that the application fees paid by the applicants in the second session be applicable for the continuation of the applications in the present session.

Motion agreed to.

DEPUTY CHAIRMAN

Hon. Mr. Wells moved that the member for York Centre (Mr. Cousens) be appointed deputy chairman of the committees of the whole House for this session.

Motion agreed to.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

EMERGENCY PLANS ACT

Hon. G. W. Taylor moved, seconded by Hon. Mr. Eaton, first reading of Bill 2, An Act to provide for the Formulation and Implementation of Emergency Plans.

Motion agreed to.

MOTOR VEHICLE DEALERS AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Elgie moved, seconded by Hon. Mr. Gregory, first reading of Bill 3, An Act to amend the Motor Vehicle Dealers Act.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, I am sure everyone here today has heard of the Ontario travel industry compensation fund. In the past seven years, this fund has paid out more than \$2.5 million to consumers who had claims arising out of the collapse of travel agencies and companies. This is the kind of industry initiative that deserves the full support and appreciation of the government and the public. I am pleased, therefore, to reintroduce today amendments to the Motor Vehicle Dealers Act that will set up a similar fund to compensate consumers who are caught in the collapse of a car dealership.

By way of background, the Motor Vehicle Dealers Act was set up in 1965. At that time a \$5,000 bond posted by each of the car dealerships was enough to cover potential consumer claims but, as the industry has rightly pointed out, it is not enough today. Some dealerships are running trust accounts as high as \$20,000 and acceptance of \$1,000 deposits is commonplace. A \$5,000 bond would not go very far if a dealership ever went under and the trust account was not intact.

As well, the industry has told us that posting bonds has become increasingly expensive and the processing of claims is time-consuming and cumbersome. After meetings with the industry, we have decided to amend the act to establish a compensation fund.

COLLECTION AGENCIES AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Elgie moved, seconded by Hon. Mr. Gregory, first reading of Bill 4, An Act to amend the Collection Agencies Act.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing for first reading an amendment to the Collection Agencies Act. By way of background, we have now in place a set of guidelines outlining the kinds of methods that should be used to collect debts. The registrar of the act ensures that all collection agencies are aware of these guidelines, which have been in effect for many years, but the industry feels it would be everyone's best interests to have the guidelines clearly spelled out in the act so that all agencies

are following a set of rules enforceable by law. This would also give the public a clearer understanding of what collection agencies can and cannot do.

At present, the act only allows us to draft regulations governing methods. In the regulation, we are planning to formalize practices. The difference between a method and a practice is not clearly defined so we decided our best approach was to amend the act to enable us to draft regulations governing both practices and methods. Once this is done, the new regulations can be finalized.

These amendments to the regulations will include prohibitions on the following: (1) trying to collect money from someone who says he or she is not responsible for the debt, without checking all the facts; (2) phoning a debtor before he or she has been informed by letter that the account has been turned over to a collection agency; (3) demanding payment of a debt without first identifying the agency, individual collector and the creditor; and (4) launching legal action without first telling the debtor.

BOILERS AND PRESSURE VESSELS AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Elgie moved, seconded by Hon. Mr. Gregory, first reading of Bill 5, An Act to amend the Boilers and Pressure Vessels Act.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, I am reintroducing for first reading amendments to the Boilers and Pressure Vessels Act aimed at eliminating unnecessary slowdowns when boilers, pressure vessels and plants need repair.

4 p.m.

Section 32 of the act now requires that when a boiler, pressure vessel or plant is found to be unsafe, it must be examined by a ministry inspector both before and after being repaired. Since most boilers, pressure vessels and plants are insured, they are inspected by government certified inspectors. Clearly, the function performed by our inspectors can be performed by government-certified personnel from insurance companies. This bill would make this permissible but not mandatory.

Officials from my ministry have reached agreement with the appropriate insurance companies that their certified personnel will supervise and approve repair work done to boilers and pressure vessels that they insure.

In addition, under subsection 32(3), it would authorize the government chief inspector to

exempt owners of plants operated around the clock from having major repairs approved by either a government or an insurance inspector when the chief inspector is satisfied that the repairs will be performed safely and properly by qualified personnel. Current provisions represent a hardship for refineries, petrochemical plants and similar operations which have their own trained inspection staffs which operate around the clock. There is little point in making them shut down while a government inspector checks their work. The terms and conditions of exemption will be clearly set out in regulations.

Amendments to section 2 will extend the definition of employer for the purposes of section 36 of the act and will eliminate the unnecessary testing of welders changing jobs but still employed members of the trade association.

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION AND PROTECTION OF PRIVACY ACT

Mr. Breithaupt moved, seconded by Mr. T. P. Reid, first reading of Bill 6, An Act to provide for Freedom of Information and Protection of Individual Privacy.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Speaker, this bill provides a broad and comprehensive scheme for public access to and protection of individual privacy with respect to information held by government. While the topic of freedom of information was referred to in the speech from the throne in 1977, in 1980 and in 1981, no such reference was made yesterday. Since apparently the matter is no longer a great priority for the government, the bill again shows how seriously we in the opposition view the need for legislation in this important area.

SUCCESSION LAW ACT

Mr. Breithaupt moved, seconded by Mr. T. P. Reid, first reading of Bill 8, An Act respecting the Succession to Estates of Deceased Persons in Ontario who have Beneficiaries residing in Designated Countries.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Speaker, this legislation is commonly referred to as the Soviet estates bill. The purpose of it is to ensure that payments from the estates of persons domiciled in Ontario at the time of death are not made to foreign beneficiaries who are unlikely to receive for their whole benefit or use substantially the full

value of any payments made under the estate and who reside in certain countries designated by regulation.

The bill provides for an application to be made to a court for an order permitting payments to a foreign beneficiary. The court may also order that no payment be made to a foreign beneficiary, in which case the court shall make an order disposing of the estate in accordance with the rules of succession contained in the Succession Law Reform Act with necessary modifications.

While the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry) has in the past shown interest in this matter, and it was Bill 1 on one occasion, the failure even to refer to this subject in yesterday's throne speech is disappointing. Here is a bill that can do the necessary job, and I commend it to the Legislature.

ELECTION AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Breithaupt moved, seconded by Mr. Epp, first reading of Bill 9, An Act to amend the Election Act.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Speaker, this bill amends the Election Act for several purposes and is a repetition of the bill I introduced some time ago. The principal changes to the act include the following:

First, the British subject basis for qualification as a voter or candidate in an election is removed so that all voters and candidates must now be Canadian citizens.

Second, the chief election officer is given authority to set standards for convenient access to polling places by persons who are physically handicapped.

Third, the bill provides that so far as is reasonably possible all polling stations should be and all advance polls must be accessible to persons who are physically handicapped.

Fourth, persons who are physically handicapped are permitted to name voting proxies up to and including the day of the election.

Fifth, the political affiliation of candidates would be shown on the ballot.

Sixth, campaign material is prohibited from being brought into a place near a polling place on election day.

Seventh, the procedure for establishing the qualifications of a voter whose name has been omitted in error from a polling list is extended to all polling subdivisions rather than simply rural subdivisions.

Eighth, the restriction that limits a person to

assisting only one blind person in voting is removed.

Yesterday the speech from the throne told us of the preparations for Ontario's bicentennial in 1984. The best way we can mark that anniversary would be to ensure that in any future general election in Ontario only Canadian citizens will have the right to vote.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Breithaupt moved, seconded by Mr. Conway, first reading of Bill 10, An Act to amend the Legislative Assembly Act.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Speaker, again I introduce this bill, whose purpose is to provide for the appointment of a curator of Queen's Park. The curator of Queen's Park would be responsible for advising the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly and the Lieutenant Governor in Council concerning the conservation, protection and preservation of the heritage of Queen's Park.

Again, the reference in yesterday's throne speech to our bicentennial reminds us that this 1983 is the 90th anniversary of this building. I suggest it is most appropriate to ensure that the fabric of our legislative heritage be maintained and strengthened for the years to come.

4:10 p.m.

LANDLORD AND TENANT AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Philip moved, seconded by Mr. Swart, first reading of Bill 11, An Act to amend the Landlord and Tenant Act.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Philip: Mr. Speaker, some members are upset that I have created more housing than the government, but this bill, which should have been introduced by the member for Lakeshore (Mr. Kolyn), is to protect his tenants. It is a bill intended to prevent the circumvention of municipal condominium conversion bylaws and section 60 of the Condominium Act by making it clear that, despite the recent unreported decision of the Divisional Court in Medeiros versus Fraleigh, the owner of a percentage interest or a share in an apartment building cannot evict a tenant under section 105 or clause 107(1)(b) of the Landlord and Tenant Act.

LABOUR RELATIONS AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Mackenzie moved, seconded by Mr.

Breaugh, first reading of Bill 12, An Act to amend the Labour Relations Act.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Mackenzie: Mr. Speaker, this bill would make the hiring of or acting as a professional strikebreaker an offence; prevent the hiring of persons to replace employees who are on a legal strike or are locked out except by agreement with the effective bargaining unit; and control access to work premises affected by a strike or lockout.

Transport, removal and handling of the employer's product would be prohibited during a strike or lockout except by agreement with the effective bargaining unit or by order of the Ontario Labour Relations Board.

A designated representative of the bargaining unit would be entitled to inspect the employer's work premises and the board would be empowered to make and enforce its actions concerning contraventions of the prohibitions contained in the bill.

CAMBRIDGE HORNETS

Mr. Barlow: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege: I would like to point out to you and to the members of this Legislature that last night in the Shade Street arena in the great city of Cambridge the Cambridge Hornets returned the Allan Cup to Ontario and to Cambridge.

Interjections.

Mr. Barlow: I understand it was a little bit on the rough side. Unfortunately, I was not able to attend last night's game. It was the fourth time in about the past 14 years that the Allan Cup has rested in Cambridge. We are very pleased at that, and I would like the members of the House to join me in congratulating the Cambridge Hornets.

[Applause]

MOTION TO SET ASIDE ORDINARY BUSINESS

Mr. Mackenzie moved, seconded by Mr. Foulds, that pursuant to standing order 34(a), the ordinary business of the House be set aside to discuss a matter of urgent public importance, namely, the harassment of workers on legal picket lines at Central Precision and Alcan in Scarborough, which has led to numerous arrests, confrontations, some injuries and the death of a worker, Claude Dougdeen, and which undermines the faith of working people, particularly new Canadians, in the fairness of the justice system in this province.

Mr. Speaker: I would like to mention to all honourable members that the notice of motion under standing 34(a) has been received in time. I will be prepared to listen for up to five minutes as to why the honourable member thinks the ordinary business of the House should be set aside.

Mr. Mackenzie: Mr. Speaker, what has been happening in the one or two cases I mentioned in the motion makes the case as well as I can. What is happening to faith in the justice system in this province is a serious question. No worker takes a strike lightly. If one has been through a few of them, either oneself or had the responsibility for them, one knows it is a decision which is a serious one for workers to make. I want to treat this matter in a responsible and serious manner.

Once a worker has decided his only recourse is a strike, a vote has been held and he is now in a legal strike position, he is up against the loss of his paycheque and the threat to his job. To get conditions he feels are fair to work under, he has had to make that decision and take that risk.

What happens and what has been happening? I do not know a case that underlines it better than the Central Precision strike in this city. Within a matter of hours of that strike starting, a private security firm, Securicor, had been called. What is the general practice from day to day? Almost from day one the security firm's cars are inside the plant. They move up to the picket line at 6:45 in the morning with the strikebreakers the company is hiring to try to keep that plant going, people who are seen by the workers as stealing their jobs, in effect, or trying to. The cars move up and the cameras start rolling, right as the cars come through with the strikebreakers in the operation.

What happens? The harassment is rather fantastic. One would think responsible people would not react to provocation, but it has to be understood it is their jobs at stake and they have taken a very serious decision already. What they get from inside the vans from the workers being brought in is the famous finger—if one likes, “up yours;” and I apologize to the House—and a series of provocations. Not only that, senior officials of the security firm in there have come up to the picket line with big grins on their faces to say to the workers and officers of the local: “Keep it up. It does not matter if a couple of cars get scratched. The longer you keep this strike up, the longer we are picking up \$20,000 a week.” The kind of harassment there is fantastic.

What happens then? The security firm goes

down to the local justice of the peace and swears out a warrant, usually for mischief. There have been 27 of them sworn out. On one occasion, April 6, the local police chose seven o'clock in the morning to arrive to arrest four of the key people in the strike, based on warrants which had been issued days before. This is a new wrinkle we are getting in the whole picket line scene. They arrest them on the line, demoralizing the workers there. They take them down. Three of those four workers spent the night in jail. They went through all the processes. Only one of them was released. We have now had 27 such warrants issued.

In one case, a young Portuguese worker who did not know the warrant was out for him was called by the union, went down to the police station and was immediately put in handcuffs. That was a mischief warrant that was sworn out. The union itself has great difficulty in filing charges with this same justice of the peace.

This is the kind of situation we have going on. One wonders why occasionally there is some trouble on that picket line. Those same workers see, after the confrontation has taken place, usually in the morning, the police car go across the street to the parking lot and the Securicor car park beside the police car. They roll down the windows, exchange smokes and talk for one half to three quarters of an hour right in front of the workers on that picket line.

One wonders why something happens such as happened at Alcan. While there had not been the immediate trouble on that line, they decided to run the trucks in the middle of the night without telling anybody. Then one wonders why the workers on those picket lines, more and more, just as in the case of injuries in another strike that came to me while I was preparing for the House today, say to us, "Where is the justice?" These are new Canadians. In this particular plant they are mostly Portuguese workers who came to this new country because they thought there was fairness here. They ask: "How can the police do this? How can the company do this? We are in a legal strike situation. Does it not mean anything?"

4:20 p.m.

This is the danger, Mr. Speaker, that I am raising with you. We have a problem, and what is happening? Not just deliberate harassment but deliberate intimidation of the workers in legal strike situations. It is time this province took some action to deal with this kind of situation, and if that means legislation, then it is

long overdue. Yes, there is a responsibility for what happened on this government.

Mr. Wrye: Mr. Speaker, my party will support the motion as submitted by the honourable member for Hamilton East asking for an emergency debate on this very important issue, the issue of protecting workers on picket lines from the effects of strikebreakers. It is not only very important, but certainly in the case at Alcan, ultimately a very tragic circumstance.

It seems to me very important that this Legislature be offered an opportunity to debate this matter. It is a matter on which my colleagues have from time to time introduced private members' legislation. The late member for Sarnia, Mr. Bullbrook, introduced such legislation; my colleague the member for London North (Mr. Van Horne) introduced legislation dealing with the issue of strikebreakers back in 1979; and my colleague the member for Essex South (Mr. Mancini) also introduced legislation a few years ago.

I think it is very important that we debate this whole matter and then have the government present legislation that would bring Ontario into an area that has so far had legislation only from British Columbia and Quebec. It is certainly an area that is long overdue.

It is clear that the actions and activities, particularly of professional strikebreakers, organizations such as Securicor, in the long run damage good labour relations, not obviously at the time the strike is occurring, because good labour relations have already suffered a certain amount of damage, but they damage a recovery of good labour relations and a co-operative attitude between the two parties for months and sometimes for years after the end of a legal labour dispute. That is clearly not in the interests of either side and ultimately it is not in the interests of Ontario.

It is unfortunate, it seems to me, that we have given the right to strike to working men and women in this province and then have not taken action to ensure that they are not victimized by harassment and even worse by these professional strikebreaking firms during the legal dispute.

In reading this motion, I was bothered by one area, and I want to bring this particularly to the attention of the House. It is the section at the end of the motion that says, "and which undermines the faith of working people, particularly new Canadians, in the fairness of the justice system in this province."

I want to take quite strong exception to that

because it represents to my mind and to that of my colleagues, perhaps in an innocent way, a very insidious attempt to introduce some kind of artificial distinction. Indeed, some would suggest that, perhaps inadvertently, using the phrase "particularly new Canadians" borders in a sense on some kind of racism.

Mr. Mackenzie: Obviously, you people are never in picket lines.

Mr. Wrye: I have been on a picket line. I do not need to be lectured by the member for Hamilton East.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Wrye: I think the incidents are serious enough that they can be treated with real integrity and that the use of the wording "particularly new Canadians" tends to cheapen it. I think I would have wanted it to say at the end, "which undermines the faith of all people in the justice system of Ontario," whether they are new Canadians or whether they have been here for generations on end, because it ultimately does affect all of us here in Ontario when we have a situation where working men and women are subjected to the kind of problems that have occurred, most particularly with the professional firms at Central Precision Ltd. and those that have led to the tragedy at Alcan Building Products Ltd.

I hope the minister will stand in his place in a minute and indicate that the government is prepared to proceed with this emergency debate and that it will use the time and listen to members from all three parties during the emergency debate to hear the various legislative initiatives that members of all parties would like to see this government take, and that we will not stall with study upon study but move quickly so we can have legislative initiatives introduced during the spring session and passed into law, for they are long overdue in this province.

We have a multitude of examples not only from Canada, but from many of the states south of the border. I think the time for study has passed and it is time for the minister and this government to proceed and bring us legislation which will end this very shabby practice which really lowers labour relations in Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: The member's time has expired.

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to the resolution by the member for Hamilton East which calls upon this House to set aside its ordinary business and to conduct a special debate in respect to incidents which

have recently occurred on the picket lines at Central Precision Ltd. and Alcan Building Products Ltd.

It submitted that the developments of recent days, including the tragic death of Claude Dougdeen, have served to undermine the faith of working people in the fairness of the justice system in this province. I cannot accept this statement.

At the outset, we must understand what picketing is all about. In Ontario the right of employees engaged in a lawful work stoppage to peacefully picket their employer's business premises has long been recognized. The primary purpose of the picket line is to communicate information concerning the dispute, to achieve solidarity within the work force, to influence other workers not to displace the striking employees and to appeal to the community at large for its moral support.

By and large, picketing in this province has been conducted in a peaceful manner without incident. Generally speaking, trade unions and their members are aware of their rights and obligations in relation to picket-line activity. Similarly, the police forces of this province are aware of the purpose of the picket line and are capable of ensuring that the rights of employers and employees are protected. In my view, the existing collective bargaining procedure with its attendant right to picket has well served the interest of the labour movement over the years.

Currently, we all recognize that the tensions inherent in the collective bargaining of a dispute often find their expression on the picket line. Understandably, emotions run high amongst employees who have experienced an interruption in their income, are concerned about preserving their jobs and are uncertain about the outcome of the dispute resolution process. Despite the potential for confrontation, the record shows that our system has generally accommodated these tensions without incident.

The resolution by the honourable member refers to two particular collective bargaining disputes, the facts of which are quite distinct. As I have noted and as I am sure all members of the House are aware, a member of the United Steelworkers, Claude Dougdeen, died as a result of injuries sustained on the picket line at Alcan Building Products Ltd. This was a great tragedy.

However, no evidence has come to my attention to indicate the improper conduct on the part of the employer or any of the employees on the picket line. It is my understanding that the investigation is continuing and that an inquest

will be held. At the present time it would be inappropriate for me to comment on the precise circumstances of the tragic passing.

In contrast, there has been a great deal of continuing tension in the dispute between Central Precision Ltd. and the United Steelworkers of America. It is alleged by the striking employees that the security firm retained by the employer has engaged in improper surveillance and provocation. The consequent anger and frustration have been expressed by the striking employees establishing a picket line at the personal residences of officers of the company and by leafletting the neighbours of at least one of the company's officials. There have been a number of arrests and charges laid related to alleged unlawful conduct on the picket line.

I have spoken with my colleague the Solicitor General (Mr. G. W. Taylor), who is receiving detailed reports regarding the involvement of the Metropolitan Toronto Police in this dispute. The Solicitor General advises me that he has carefully reviewed these reports and has concluded that there has been no improper conduct on the part of the police in the performance of their most difficult and sensitive functions.

If the honourable member or any other person has any particular complaints in respect to the conduct of the police, he may wish to address them to the Solicitor General in question period or by telephone or letter. I am sure he would be interested in receiving any such information.

I understand that the justice of the peace before whom informations have been laid in this matter has in some cases issued warrants for the arrest of certain employees rather than proceeding by summons. I also understand that many of these informations have been laid by the agents of the security firm retained by the employer. The member will appreciate the decision as to whether a warrant or a summons should be issued is ultimately a matter of judicial discretion.

It is certainly not appropriate for the Minister of Labour to comment on the exercise of such discretion. If the member has reason to believe that this discretion has been abused he may wish to communicate his complaint to the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry), bearing in mind that that no minister would have the right to interfere with the exercise of judicial discretion.

4:30 p.m.

While I can certainly understand the member's concern, I believe the matters he has raised can be and are being adequately addressed

in existing procedures. For this reason I would oppose the member's resolution for an emergency debate.

Mr. Speaker: I have listened with great interest to the submissions put forward by the representatives of all three parties in the House. I must say I do find some grounds for the debate. However, I must say, too, that because of the beginning of the throne speech debate we are going to have a better opportunity and more opportunity to discuss this and other matters without any time limit, as would be imposed if we were to discuss it this afternoon. Therefore, I am of the opinion that the motion should not be put at this time.

Mr. McClellan: I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, you leave us no choice other than to challenge your ruling.

4:50 p.m.

The House divided on the Speaker's ruling, which was sustained on the following vote:

Ayes

Andrewes, Ashe, Barlow, Bennett, Bernier, Birch, Brandt, Cousens, Cureatz, Davis, Dean, Eaton, Elgie, Eves, Fish, Gillies, Gordon, Gregory, Grossman, Harris, Havrot, Henderson, Hodgson, Johnson, J. M., Jones, Kells, Kerr, Kolyn, Lane, Leluk, MacQuarrie, McCaffrey, McCague, McLean, McNeil, Mitchell;

Norton, Piché, Pollock, Pope, Ramsay, Robinson, Rotenberg, Runciman, Scrivener, Sheppard, Sterling, Stevenson, K. R., Taylor, G. W., Taylor, J. A., Timbrell, Treleaven, Villeneuve, Walker, Watson, Welch, Williams, Wiseman.

Nays

Allen, Boudria, Bradley, Breaugh, Breithaupt, Bryden, Charlton, Conway, Cooke, Copps, Cunningham, Di Santo, Edighoffer, Elston, Epp, Grande, Haggerty, Johnston, R. F., Kerrio, Laughren, Lupusella, Mackenzie, Mancini, Martel, McClellan, McKessock, Miller, G. I.;

Newman, Nixon, O'Neil, Peterson, Philip, Rae, Foulds, Reed, J. A., Reid, T. P., Renwick, Riddell, Roy, Ruprecht, Ruston, Samis, Sargent, Spensieri, Stokes, Swart, Van Horne, Worton, Wrye.

Ayes 58, nays 49.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

Consideration of the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

Mr. Brandt moved, seconded by Mr. Eves, that an humble address be presented to the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor as follows:

To the Honourable John Black Aird, an officer of the Order of Canada, one of Her Majesty's counsel learned in the law, Bachelor of Arts, Doctor of Laws, Lieutenant Governor of Ontario:

We, Her Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Legislative Assembly of the province of Ontario, now assembled, beg leave to thank Your Honour for the gracious speech Your Honour has addressed to us.

Mr. Brandt: Mr. Speaker, first I would like to say how pleased and proud I am to have the honour to move adoption of the speech from the throne. I would also like to suggest that no member be allowed to leave his place until I have finished my remarks.

This marks the opening of the third session of the 32nd Parliament of Ontario and I am especially proud to be speaking as a member of the great Progressive Conservative Party of Ontario.

Over the past year, being a member of this government has allowed me to contribute to many worthwhile activities. For instance, in my capacity as the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Ramsay), a gentleman I have great admiration for, I had the opportunity and was able to guide through the House changes to the Workmen's Compensation Act, an act which, for one thing, changed its name to the Workers' Compensation Act in order to reflect this government's recognition of the growing role of women in this province and the role those women are playing in our labour force.

The bill also increased Workers' Compensation Board benefits to help recipients cope with increases in the cost of living. As I recall the debate at that time, there was concern from a number of members on the opposition benches with respect to the level of increase that was being provided by this government. I am proud to say that if one looks at the levels of inflation at this time and the increases that were approved by the government one will note that the workers' compensation benefits are substantially above the present level of inflation.

5 p.m.

I have also been honoured to represent the Minister of Labour and the ministry on many other occasions, both in public and in government activities—none that were paid for by the

government, members will be pleased to know, other than when on occasion I did make the odd trip where I managed to quite accidentally bump into certain members of the other parties.

Mr. Roy: I was a member of a one-man task force.

Mr. Brandt: I have had the opportunity to participate in hearings on the standing committee on resources development as it studied the Weiler report's suggestions for ways to revamp the entire system of workers' compensation in Ontario. I think the members of the opposition will agree with me, at least in this one remark, that this is essential and critical legislation that we will be looking at very carefully in the weeks ahead.

I have also been part of the select committee on pensions and of the standing committee on administration of justice as it examined both the government's economic restraint package and the rent restraint bill.

As the member for Sarnia, I was able to introduce a bill establishing the City of Sarnia Foundation, which would receive, manage and use donations for charitable purposes in the Sarnia community. Sarnia was once almost a forgotten part of this great province but I believe, now that representation has changed, that forgotten part of the province is now being remembered.

As a member of the government under the leadership of our great Premier (Mr. Davis), I would like to bring to the attention of the members opposite the number of different ways in which the Sarnia area has been remembered.

Highway 402, which goes through the London area, as the Minister of Industry and Trade (Mr. Walker) will know, and is so important to our community in the Sarnia area, was completed in 1982, not only on time and not only as promised, but within the budget limitations as set by the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Snow). That is certainly different from some other levels of government that I might point to on occasion that have great difficulty in keeping their budgets in line.

Our community has received \$2.75 million from the Board of Industrial Leadership and Development for the Sarnia Bay marina project. We expect this project to act as a catalyst for more development, both private and public, for the Sarnia area and, more particularly, to attract new visitors to our area from the United States. A boost in tourism will naturally create more jobs in the related service industries.

A little more than a year ago, the Honourable

Lieutenant Governor of Ontario was in this chamber to deliver the speech from the throne for the second session of our 32nd Parliament. The Lieutenant Governor noted then that this House was meeting at a time when the people of this province were facing severe economic difficulties. These problems were not endemic to Ontario, but were being experienced throughout Canada and by all nations in the industrialized western world.

The speech from the throne made it clear that the top priority of this government would be to put Ontario on as positive an economic track as possible. This government has honoured that commitment. A courageous budget, an equitable restraint program and innovative job creation and economic stimulation policies have not only helped the people of Ontario through a prolonged severe international recession, not of our making, but have placed us in a position to take full advantage of current positive economic developments.

I say with justifiable pride that in Ontario these positive developments have been encouraged and assisted by the programs and policies of the Progressive Conservative government.

Ontario now faces a time of great opportunity and challenge. There are many positive indications that our economy is poised to make a sustained recovery. Business confidence, especially when one looks at a number of current conditions, has strengthened very considerably in the last few weeks and months. Lower mortgage rates have stimulated the housing market at both the national and provincial levels.

Mr. Martel: Oh, you'll take credit for that too, will you?

Mr. Brandt: Well, we were being blamed for it earlier.

Nationally, the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corp. reports that housing starts in March translated into an annualized rate of 177,000 units for 1983, and I might add that this is considerably higher than the 150,000 to 155,000 housing starts that were originally forecast for this year.

In Ontario, housing sales are extremely encouraging. Last month the Toronto Real Estate Board reported that March 1983—thanks in great part to some of the stimulative measures taken by the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Mr. Bennett)—was the third best sales month in the entire history of that board. As the board noted, buyers have expressed their confidence in the economic upturn by investing one

third of a billion dollars in homes over that period.

The stimulative effect this recovery will have on the furniture, lumber and appliance industries can only be estimated but it will be very substantial. Depleted inventories and increased demand should contribute to a healthy turnaround in those sectors and ultimately strengthen employment opportunities as well.

All indications from the automotive industry suggest equally brisk expansion in 1983. Canadian exports of automotive products increased sharply in January from their late 1982 levels. The country's current trade surplus in vehicles approaches \$5 billion, and the parts shortfall has recently narrowed to \$3 billion. Reduced United States inventories of Canadian-made car models have been supporting the pace of auto exports and production.

The effect of this recovery is already being felt in Ontario. For example, General Motors has recently returned to double-shift operations at all of its assembly plants.

Mr. Nixon: Who wrote this?

Mr. Brandt: As a matter of fact I did, I would like to say to the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk.

The stronger output trend has been equally beneficial to the province's steel industry, where activity has begun to accelerate after a very disappointing year of operation in 1982.

Although there has been a marked and real improvement in the performance of our automotive industry, there remain a number of problems that threaten the long-term viability of that very important sector of our economy. The speech from the throne demonstrates that this government is not only aware of those problems but has committed itself to help solve them. The introduction of a quota system for imported cars and the introduction of Canadian content rules strike me as being practical and effective solutions to the difficulties that beset this industry. I am sure all members of this House join me in applauding this government's determination to press Ottawa for the creation of these safeguards to protect the Ontario industry and Ontario jobs.

Mr. Conway: Where do you stand on the Lada?

Mr. Boudria: Does Jim Taylor still drive a Lada?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Cousens): Order.

Mr. Brandt: I will see if I have time to tag it on to the end of this one; I know the speech well.

In the longer term, I think the idea that all imports of automobiles into the Canadian market should be governed by the same requirements as those set out in the Canada-US auto pact should be adopted by the federal government. I hope Ottawa will respond positively to Ontario's suggestions and recommendations with respect to the automotive industry.

5:10 p.m.

Interest rates have dropped dramatically from the stratospheric heights to which they had been boosted by the policies of the federal government. At times it appeared that the federal Liberal government was unaware of the devastating impact high interest rates had on consumer purchases. People simply stopped buying and they are still proceeding only with great caution and uncertainty when it comes to major purchases. Fortunately this trend has reversed to some extent over the past couple of months, but only after causing considerable damage to our industries and considerable hardship for our people.

Lower interest rates cannot be anything but good news to manufacturers and consumers. Consumers will be encouraged to make purchases, particularly of big-ticket items, which they have postponed because of those high rates. Increased consumer buying will deplete already low inventories. Certainly the liquidation of business inventories represents a real opportunity for economic growth in 1983. More than \$8.5 billion in stockpiled merchandise was siphoned off in 1982, sometimes at the expense of unemployed workers who remained inactive while inventories were reduced, but now the cupboard is bare in many retail outlets and that bodes well for accelerated employment and production.

Another factor that points to a recovery is the significant decline in the rate of inflation. In 1981 and 1982 the consumer price index grew at rates of 12.5 per cent and 10.8 per cent respectively. By 1983, on a year-over-year basis, the inflation rate had dropped to the six per cent to seven per cent range. This moderation in the rate of inflation will increase the spending power of consumers throughout Ontario.

Already there are signs of increasing consumer confidence. Statistics Canada reported that Ontario's retail sales in February had increased by 7.5 per cent, one of the highest of any province in the entire country.

All the elements necessary for an economic recovery appear to be in place. It is up to us to bring together and build on those elements. If

we are to take full advantage of the opportunities offered to us, as the government we must do two things. First of all, we must design and implement policies that will enable us to exploit positive economic developments for the immediate good of the province. At the same time, however, these policies must not have the unintended effect of stifling those very sectors on which our recovery is being built.

We in this Legislature have the opportunity to make a real contribution to economic recovery by supporting legislation and programs that will enhance and speed the improvement of economic conditions. It has been the practice of this government in the past to constructively participate, as opposed to destructively interfere, in the economy of the province. We must continue this approach and act only in those areas where support or stimulation is required—in other words, in a very selective way. We must not compromise the opportunities before us.

The programs outlined in the throne speech prove that this government intends to continue its constructive participation in the economy of the province. The three-part program in particular represents a constructive response to the economic realities of the day.

The second thing we must do is to maintain a feeling of optimism and confidence both in this House and in the province at large. The world recession has created what is a crisis of confidence in the minds of many. It has made many of us fear the future and lose faith in our abilities because of the economic uncertainties that are all around us. This loss of confidence paralyses the will to act, to take risks, to invest and to persevere.

Just as important as the economic aspects of any recovery will be the recovery of our self-confidence, which I believe we need very desperately in this very difficult age. Indeed, we may not attain the former unless we at first achieve the latter. We must remember that we do not get the plum unless we have the courage to shake the tree. With this throne speech this government demonstrates that it is looking to Ontario's future with confidence and optimism, something that I wish was shared to a greater extent by some of the members opposite.

Interjections.

Mr. Brandt: Pessimists; purveyors of doom and gloom.

I share that sense of confidence in our strength and abilities, and optimism in our future. That is not to say that I do not on rare occasions experience moments of doubt when I

question the ability of our province to successfully meet the many challenges that await us.

However, I have never fallen into the depths of despair and timidity that appear to be the natural habitat of many of the members opposite. Their unshakeable conviction that the sky over Ontario is falling is really exaggeration in the extreme. The gloom which emanates from that part of the House is nearly impenetrable. The entire area over there reminds me of a large black cloud that is constantly hovering above their heads.

I do not think the negativism of the opposition parties is in any way an accurate reflection of the mood or the spirit of the people of Ontario. Rather, I believe Ontarians have confidence in themselves and in the government of which I am proud to be a part.

I appreciate that one of the tasks of the members opposite is to attempt to convince first themselves and then anyone who will listen that the people of this province do not have confidence in this government.

I recall an advertisement sponsored by the Liberal Party of Ontario during the last general election. Other members may remember that particular advertisement as well. The video part of the ad showed a suitcase being snapped shut and labelled with stickers bearing the names of destinations to the west of Ontario. I am sure some of the members opposite recall that sparkling ad with great clarity.

Meanwhile, the voice-over was intoning that every 17 minutes somebody left Ontario. The ad made a particular point of telling us that many of these people were young people. The ad, I believe, concluded with some suggestion like, "What will your kids be doing 17 minutes from now?"

The intent and implication of the advertisement was quite obvious. The effectiveness of the ad and the rest of the campaign is evident in the seating arrangements in this House.

Mr. Nixon: More people voted against you than voted for you.

Mr. Brandt: Far more people voted against my friend and his collective cohorts, if I may suggest that.

Canadians have always moved within the federation in search of greater economic opportunity and for other reasons which, while they may have nothing to do with money, are of considerable importance to the individual's self-fulfilment.

Many Canadians exercise their mobility rights. Many who do exercise these rights come to

Ontario. I believe the immediate past leader of the official opposition came to Ontario from Quebec. In fact, I think the family of the current leader migrated some time ago from western Canada to Ontario. I would venture to say that in each case, aside from their rather unfortunate choice in politics, each of these gentlemen has prospered here in Ontario.

Mr. Conway: You've been on both sides of the fence.

Mr. Brandt: That is why I am over here, because I have seen what the other side of the fence looks like.

Leaving that aside—I ask my friends to listen carefully to this, because I am going to return to the Liberals' 1981 theme; I think it is quite valid in the context of this debate—it is apparent that the Liberal Party was attempting to link the fact that Ontario had a net migratory deficit in 1981 to its claim that this government had mishandled the affairs of this province and had consequently reduced opportunities for its people. I believe that was the story they were attempting to tell in that fine ad they put on.

5:20 p.m.

I will speak slowly so members opposite can follow this. If a migratory deficit can be taken as proof of mismanagement, then following the official opposition's reasoning, surplus should be taken as proof of good management. Would the reverse not hold? I expect that members opposite will be saddened to learn that in 1982 Ontario experienced a net interprovincial migration surplus of almost 3,500 people. So much for those great suitcase ads. Even during the 1981 campaign, I must confess that I found the Liberals' ad somewhat puzzling.

Interjections.

The Acting Speaker: Order.

Mr. Brandt: One of the provinces whose name appeared on the suitcase, supposedly a prime destination in this mass exodus, was Alberta.

Interjections.

The Acting Speaker: Order. The honourable members are interjecting far too much.

Interjections.

The Acting Speaker: The Speaker is losing patience.

Mr. Brandt: In that ad campaign I believe one of the destinations being suggested by the opposition party was the province of Alberta. I would like to say that Alberta has two things to recommend it. First, they have oil, of which we

would dearly love to have a larger supply here in our own province. But they also have a strong Progressive Conservative government, I might add. Those people who for whatever reason did leave Ontario went to a province that was also being served by a Progressive Conservative government.

There was another province which received mention on the side of the Liberal suitcase that was used in those infamous advertisements; it happened to be the province of Saskatchewan. I need not remind this House that the good people of Saskatchewan have recently elected a Progressive Conservative government as well. It seems that when the people of any province want sound, responsible management of public affairs, they turn to a Progressive Conservative Party.

Of course I am certain the Liberals would have preferred to have been able to put the names of provinces governed by the Liberal Party on their suitcase. However, that is just not possible in this day and age since there are no provincial Liberal governments anywhere across this great country of ours. That is the truth. I was hesitant in bringing it up, but I felt compelled to bring it up because of some of the questions that were asked across the way.

I would also like to point out to the members of the official opposition that since the member for Brampton (Mr. Davis) entered the cabinet, the Ontario Liberal Party has changed leaders on the average of once every 3.3 years. I would like then to ask them what their current leader will be doing 17 months from now, because that is the average tenure for a leader in their particular party.

This year this House reconvenes at a pivotal moment in the history of our province. All around us technological, economic and social changes are occurring at an incredible and at times bewildering rate. Ultimately these changes will affect every area of our lives—how we work, the type of work we will be doing, how our children are educated, how we will use our leisure time and where we will live.

Interjection.

Mr. Brandt: It ties in very directly if the member will listen carefully, I am sure.

To ensure a complete understanding of the nature of these changes and their impact on our society, this government intends to undertake an extensive and serious study of major projected developments. Knowledge gained from this study will ensure that we will be able to respond pragmatically and effectively to what

may well prove to be a fundamental restructuring of our society as we know it today.

The way in which we respond to these changes and their impact on our social and economic lives will determine the type and nature of our society in the future. To manage these forces of change in a manner which will best serve and further the public interest will require imagination, flexibility and courage. The record of this government indicates it will be more than able to meet this challenge.

It is often said about government that as an institution it possesses the pivotal role in bringing together society's conflicting interests. Speaking personally, I see the role of government as one of mediation between opposing social forces; to improve the relationship between business and labour, between consumer and producer, landlord and tenant. Increasingly in our society, government has come to mean more to the citizens it serves. Today, in addition to its role as arbitrator of competing forces, government is being asked to accept the role of co-ordinator of harmonious interests. I staunchly defend an economic system that follows the principles of a free enterprise market, but I also recognize the importance of government as an institution of conciliation, of strategic planning and leadership.

In Ontario, as an example, the government's Board of Industrial Leadership and Development strategy is a perfect illustration of this new, evolving role of government. To date, 77 projects have been approved by BILD, part of the five-year, \$1.5-billion program of new reindustrialization in this province.

First and foremost, BILD is a long-term plan, but in the past year alone 40,000 short-term jobs were created by BILD initiatives. Equally important, BILD is a multifaceted approach to preparing Ontario for the 1980s. If we exclude electrification projects and highway improvements, more than half of all BILD initiatives include private sector funding. In total, the private sector has committed more than \$330 million to the BILD strategy, and support from the federal and municipal governments exceeds \$120 million to date.

Mr. Conway: Was Morley Rosenberg part of BILD?

Mr. Brandt: Not the last time I looked.

Most important, BILD helps people in a very practical and very sensible way. Just ask the people of Sarnia, who will benefit enormously from the Sarnia Bay project, what they think of the BILD initiatives; or the citizens of Point

Edward, who will have an expanded arena, a project that will also enjoy BILD support.

In short, the BILD strategy is a timely addition to the economic priorities of this decade. On the one hand, it will help co-ordinate, primarily with the private sector, a growth-oriented approach to the Ontario economy—something that some of the members opposite would not understand. Witness the investment in technological expertise, in job training, transportation and electrical infrastructure.

But, on the other hand, BILD will bring communities together. It is very much a human approach to economic co-ordination. It is an approach that already has significantly improved the quality of life in my constituency and indeed in many constituencies right across the province. It is my belief that economic recovery in the future will belong to imaginative people who can come up with imaginative programs like the BILD initiatives taken by this government.

This government's plan to develop internationally competitive, world-class industries in Ontario will ensure that the future will belong to the people of this province. This may well prove to be the most significant and important program announced in the speech from the throne. This government recognizes it is essential that all our business enterprises be on top of technological innovation if they are to find inventive ways of reducing operating costs, increasing productivity, creating competitive products and achieving higher profitability.

If our firms do not modernize their production processes, if our industries fail to join the technological revolution that is sweeping the industrial world, they will be left far behind. It is the obligation and the responsibility of this province to see that this does not happen. Canadian businesses, particularly those in manufacturing, are facing the greatest productivity challenge since Confederation.

5:30 p.m.

Large segments of our manufacturing base are facing economic hardships, not to mention the possibility of elimination, due to an intense wave of international competition. The domestic tariff barriers which largely kept the Canadian market for Canadian-based manufacturers are currently being lowered by approximately 50 per cent as a result of recent General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade negotiations.

Many of our manufacturers use outdated, uncompetitive manufacturing tools and equipment. This is in stark contrast to their foreign-based competitors, predominantly in the United

States, Japan and West Germany, which have invested heavily in modern computer-aided design and computer-aided manufacturing equipment, robotics and microelectronics.

As a result of all of this, foreign manufacturers are increasingly more efficient than their Canadian-based competitors and can sell higher quality goods in many instances at lower prices in both Canada and throughout the world. To assist our companies to effectively compete and survive in increasingly competitive domestic and international markets, BILD has taken steps to help our firms keep pace with technological innovation.

Our technology centres are focusing on the needs of smaller firms in specific sectors. Their primary purpose is to advise and assist small and medium-sized firms to apply the latest technologies to their operations. This confidence in the adaptability of smaller enterprises is well founded. Studies have shown that smaller firms are substantially more innovative compared to larger enterprises. Small businesses form the backbone of the economy of Ontario. They are by far the principal source of new jobs in this great province of ours.

A 1979 study conducted by the Canadian Federation of Independent Business found that Canadian manufacturing companies with fewer than 20 employees created jobs at 20 times the pace of larger companies. There are more than 240,000 small firms in Ontario, of which 14,000 are manufacturers and the remainder are service companies, retailers and technological enterprises.

Our government's policies and those policies which were reinforced in the throne speech are intended to stimulate entrepreneurial talent in order to take advantage of the opportunities offered by new technologies. The auto parts industry, for example, is dominated by small manufacturers requiring assistance to reduce process costs, to improve plant layout and product quality, and to resolve design problems for products and manufacturing processes in order to compete with the Japanese challenge of a high-quality, low-cost automobile.

For this reason Ontario established an auto parts technology centre in St. Catharines. The focus of that centre is to provide programs which will ensure, firstly, sustained productivity improvement; secondly, world-competitive quality; thirdly, timely delivery of parts; and, finally, product innovation. These four factors will be the keys to success for Canadian parts manufacturers in the new competitive environment we

are going to face in the decade ahead. The centre will assist manufacturers in finding and implementing the managerial, manufacturing and product technology necessary to meet these factors for success.

In addition, the centre will help parts companies to identify and to capitalize on opportunities for diversification into related industries. That is the kind of government intervention that creates meaningful, long-term jobs. There are tremendous opportunities for converting many manufacturing and industrial facilities to using new technologies that are available today. One of our government's objectives is to work closely with small and medium-sized firms on identifying the needed changes in their operations and to assist them through this difficult conversion period.

The microelectronics centre in Ottawa, the CAD/CAM centre in Cambridge—home of the great Hornets hockey club that just brought back the Allan Cup for the fourth time in 14 years as I recall—and the robotics centre in Peterborough are currently in the position to demonstrate how these new technologies will affect productivity and profitability. All were initiatives of the government of which I am proud to be part. There is no doubt in my mind that these technology centres will be instrumental in facilitating the plant modernization and product innovation of small businesses in this province.

I might add for the benefit of some of the members of the third party that is where some of the new jobs are going to come from in the decade ahead, as a result of the initiatives and as a result of this kind of proper thinking taken by the government I represent on this side of the House.

The technology centres are but one example of how Ontario continues to demonstrate its leadership and fulfil its commitment to strategic planning and a more prosperous future for the people of this province.

During this session we will no doubt have a number of opportunities to discuss the issues of job creation and the problems of the unemployed. The topics of jobs and joblessness will still be important even as we head out of the present recession.

In the last session of this Parliament, the government undertook a number of immediate measures to create jobs. Those measures were intended to deliver jobs to those groups, regions and sectors of our province where they would

do the most good and in a way which would produce the greatest impact per dollar spent.

Mr. Stokes: What about those one-industry towns in the north?

Mr. Brandt: I am going to mention those shortly.

Since those new programs were introduced, the number of jobs created actually exceeded the expected level, and the final count is not even in yet. In other words, the number we are going to reach is greater than we told the members.

All of us will remember that last May the government allocated an additional \$171 million to create about 31,000 short-term jobs. We have been honest with the people of Ontario. We have told them these are short-term jobs to get over the immediate problem the economy is facing now. I might add we do not suggest, as members of the third party do so frequently, that one can simply legislate jobs into existence because one wills it so. It simply is not that easy. One has to work at it and one has to work at it in the way the programs of this government have been laid out for the members to look at.

I can tell the members that most, if not all, of these programs were very successful, such as the Ontario employment incentive program which funded some 8,000 jobs in many municipalities across Ontario, about 900 more jobs than anticipated. In being honest with the members, we always reduce the target somewhat so we can exceed it and so they will applaud our efforts, but still they do not applaud our efforts.

I am sure all of us have constituents who have benefited from the many programs this government has brought into being. To my mind, the most successful programs, such as the ones I have just mentioned, were those which did their job in the fastest possible time with the least amount of red tape and bureaucracy.

Another of the efficient programs whose popularity greatly exceeded expectations was the farmstead improvement program which created over four times the expected number of jobs and for which the Ministry of Agriculture and Food granted additional funding to keep up with the large demand.

5:40 p.m.

But even with these measures in place, we all remember unemployment rates continued to increase until the start of this year. To create further jobs, Ontario and Canada each contributed \$100 million to the Canada-Ontario employ-

ment development program, COED. As well, our government agreed to spend an additional \$50 million to create 7,500 jobs co-ordinated through BILD. The COED program was established in particular to provide jobs for those who had exhausted their unemployment insurance benefits. It is currently well under way, providing employers and municipalities with opportunities to speed up and complete many worthwhile projects. For example, in my own municipality a number of projects have already been approved, ranging from a pollution study of storm sewers to additional programs for mentally, physically and emotionally handicapped children and for restoration work at one of our homes for the aged in the municipality of Sarnia.

The speech from the throne leaves no doubt that the creation of new employment opportunities for our citizens will continue to be the top priority of this government. There is also no question of this government's intention to continue to assist those of our citizens who require help in the job market. As noted in the throne speech, the recovery and the increased job opportunities that will result from it will centre mainly on the private sector.

It is my view, shared by most of the members on the government side, that the most effective job creation programs are those fiscal and development policies that will enhance investor confidence, encourage capital formation and stimulate growth in the private sector. Given that the private sector in Ontario over the last decade has generated well over 80 per cent of new permanent jobs, this approach appears to be a sane and sensible one on the part of this government.

In closing, in order to allow my colleague an opportunity to make a few very important remarks, I want to add that I listened very carefully to some of the suggestions offered by some of the members across the way. Part of the program for recovery that I hear so often is simply to spend more money, increase the deficit and, by so doing, increase the number of jobs that might be available to the citizens of Ontario.

Let me share with members a concern I have about taking that particular method of recovery on the part of this government. If it could be done as simplistically as that, simply by increasing the deficit, by spending more money and throwing it against the problems the unemployed have today, I want to tell members there would not be a poor country in the entire world,

because they would simply continue to spend, to increase their deficits, and there would be a brighter day tomorrow. That is the fallacy of socialism. It simply does not work in the real world. That is why the policies and the directions and the objectives suggested by the third party in particular, and I might add quite often by the official opposition and its cohorts in Ottawa, will not work in this country and will not work in Ontario.

I am proud to represent this government and to move the throne speech on behalf of the members of this party and on behalf of the government of Ontario.

Interjection.

Mr. Eves: Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate it if you would control the member for Cochrane North (Mr. Piché). He is eating into my time.

Having heard the remarks from the member for Sarnia—

Interjection.

Mr. Eves: Mr. Speaker, is it too late to change my mind? The member for Sarnia is always a tough act to follow.

Mr. Kerrio: Not this time.

Mr. Eves: Of course, I am always impressed by anyone who had a majority in the double digits.

Interjection.

Mr. Eves: Is that right? I did not know there were such people.

Mr. Brandt: It was an easy riding. It was a Liberal riding.

Mr. Eves: It is with great pleasure that I second the motion of my colleague the member for Sarnia that this Legislature accept the proposals set out in the government's throne speech. I know our Liberal colleagues opposite take a rather cynical view of throne speeches but that is hardly surprising, seeing as how their brethren in Ottawa have introduced only one since 1980. But in spite of opposition criticism our throne speech proposals are sound proposals. They are responsible suggestions, suggestions that are right for Ontario and right for the times.

It is true that our province has suffered along with the rest of the western world from the worst economic slowdown in over 50 years; no one is denying that, nor is anyone denying the seriousness of the plight of the unemployed. But our support systems are in place in Ontario and they are working. Ontario, in co-operation with other levels of government and by herself, is helping to provide meaningful work for the

unemployed. Equally impressive is the fact that all of this was accomplished within a framework of financial and fiscal restraint.

Mr. McClellan: What is the unemployment rate in Parry Sound?

Mr. Eves: Maybe a little bit less than yours, sir.

Following a policy of restraint and responsible management has kept our province from the disastrous economic pitfalls stumbled into by other jurisdictions. We have only to look to our sister province of Quebec and, indeed, to the federal government for those examples. We do not face a staggering uncontrolled deficit, as does Ottawa, a deficit that we have now learned will perhaps run to over \$31 billion this year if Marc Lalonde's recent leak can be believed.

In Ontario, our policy of restraint has helped us to weather those economic storms far more successfully than most other jurisdictions while still allowing us the leeway to hold out a hand to those Ontarians who have been hardest hit by economic conditions. This should be especially gratifying to my New Democratic Party colleagues who are quick to proclaim themselves the saviours of the socially disadvantaged. They have the only answers. These are the same NDP members who did everything in their power to block passage of our restraint legislation last session.

Our fiscal responsibility has given us a firm basis for future optimism. The economy is beginning to turn around and, as the throne speech indicates, our government will be doing all it can to help assist that recovery.

My colleague the member for Sarnia has taken a look at the overall picture, where our government's programs and policies have led and are leading the province. I would like to change the focus of this discussion and look at some of the individual projects and programs that are going on in various ridings across the province. Looking at our policies in this context is particularly appropriate, I think, because the story of economic hardship and recovery is one of real individuals and real communities pulling together.

Let us start with job creation, because that is one of the most important areas we have had to tackle during the past year. As the member for Sarnia has pointed out, the government's record in this area is more than impressive. The \$176-million job creation package of the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) from the last budget far exceeded all expectations, with over 40,000 new jobs now being created. Since then ventures

such as the Canada-Ontario employment development program have also proven effective in sending our people back to work.

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Peterson) was recently quoted as saying that the COED program has achieved very little. That kind of distortion serves only to weaken the credibility of the Liberal Party in Ontario. In fact, to date some 14,000 jobs have been created by some 1,700 approved projects.

Let me give members a few examples of the success of this program, starting naturally with my own riding. In Parry Sound—

Mr. Stokes: Is that in northern Ontario?

Mr. Eves: It certainly is, since 1977.

All 34 organized municipalities in my riding have received COED funding for job creation programs. The projects being carried out will help improve the quality of life in various communities. The township of Bonfield will be building a community centre with the help of the assistance it received; a new firehall will be built in the town of Parry Sound; McKellar township will eliminate safety hazards on various township roads; the village of South River will use grant money to help pay for renovations for a senior citizens' complex.

But they are not just limited to my riding or to government members' ridings. As a matter of fact I have personally assisted two projects that have recently been funded in the riding of the member for Renfrew North (Mr. Conway).

Interjections.

5:50 p.m.

Mr. Eves: A private sector project in the riding of my colleague the member for Sudbury (Mr. Gordon) will convert a fire-damaged building to a senior citizens' residence. Government funding for this project is over \$200,000 and 25 full-time and part-time staff will be employed at the home after 35 construction workers have completed the conversion. I think that brings the total jobs created in his region to over 400.

Of municipal proposals, the riding of the member for Brantford (Mr. Gillies) recently had 14 projects approved for over \$1.5 million which will provide 87 jobs in his riding, one of those areas of our province, few and far between as they may be, among the opposition benches. In the riding of the member for St. Catharines (Mr. Bradley), for example, the regional municipality of Niagara has received approval for six projects for over \$3 million, creating 95 jobs; and in Windsor there are 28 projects for a total value of \$2.2 million, creating 194 new jobs.

I could go on at much greater length but I think the message is clear. Not even the most negative member of the opposition benches could dispute the merits of the Canada-Ontario employment development program or the good that will result to these communities and the people throughout our province.

I could talk at great length about another important job creation program in the northern areas of our province, the Canada-Ontario job creation program sponsored by our own Ministry of Natural Resources and the federal government. Since February of last year, this program has seen our province contribute over \$18 million to create 80,000 weeks of work for 5,600 laid-off workers in the resource sector of our economy.

Equally encouraging is the employment incentive program of the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Mr. Bennett) which opened more than 8,000 new jobs in over 700 municipalities. I could list dozens of other initiatives. I could mention the renter-buy program, which has seen over 85 applications in my riding alone and which economists believe will create almost 40,000 man-years of work in construction and related trades across the province.

Impressive as these figures may be, I know the opposition will argue that these are temporary job creation measures, that they do not solve long-term economic problems and that we need long-term solutions. That kind of opposition response, although predictable, surprises me a little because when we get past the rhetoric the opposition is entirely bankrupt of ideas and has no positive alternative to offer.

On the other hand, I can offer a host of illustrations of our government's activities to create new long-term opportunities for businesses and individuals throughout our province. Obviously the biggest part of our long-term economic strategy is the Board of Industrial Leadership and Development program.

I would like to take a moment or two to highlight some of the smaller community-oriented projects which will prove just as important in our economic development. BILD projects to improve conditions at the Sarnia Bay marina, already alluded to by my friend; the Wye-Heritage Marina in Midland, which actually does exist, which will help bring new tourist dollars to these areas; as will the creation of the Cray Park marina in Peterborough, a project carried out with the help of \$1.7-million BILD grant. Just think of the construction jobs that these projects will create, not to mention the

economic boost they will provide their communities. These benefits will certainly be long-term.

BILD is also promoting the development and expansion of industries all over Ontario. In the riding of the member for Haldimand-Norfolk (Mr. G. I. Miller), the Norfolk Fruit Growers' Association of Simcoe received \$150,000 from BILD to finish a new apple packing line. By 1986, the association believes that this expansion will help them replace imports and increase exports for a total value of \$6.5 million.

In the riding of the member for Etobicoke (Mr. Philip), the Farmers' Market at the Ontario Food Terminal has been expanded with the help of a \$2-million BILD program to house 150 new stalls. This means more local farmers can sell directly to Toronto food and produce retailers. Obviously, the BILD program creates many jobs in many areas, a fact which I know every opposition member will appreciate.

BILD is not alone in its efforts, however. There are all kinds of other programs to help our businesses and industries get off the ground, expand and diversify. This kind of support is especially important in the north. The northern Ontario rural development agreement is helping to support and expand promising ventures in northern Ontario. In my riding alone, over \$1 million in NORDA funding has been approved—for 13 ventures recently in the Parry Sound area alone for over \$800,000.

The same can be said of our government's many other business support programs, such as the Northern Ontario Development Corp., Eastern Ontario Development Corp., the federal-provincial eastern Ontario subsidiary agreement. These encourage some flourishing businesses in the communities east of the Metropolitan Toronto border. Over the past two years \$375,000 in provincial funding has gone to the riding of the member for Prince Edward-Lennox (Mr. J. A. Taylor), to name just one example.

In my own riding I can sense a feeling of optimism and confidence in the future. Businesses and individuals are talking about economic growth and diversification, about making the most of our resources and about increasing our competitive edge.

Just let me use my own riding as an example of what can be accomplished, even during difficult economic times, with a positive attitude. The economic development commission, a fairly new idea for attracting new businesses in the west Parry Sound area of the riding, has proven extremely successful. They now have one in

Mattawa, and on the east side of the riding as well.

The work of the EDC has brought to our region an electronics firm from California, a transportation firm, a whitewater rafting project on the Magnetawan River. Many of our established firms are proving themselves more than equal to the task of developing new opportunities, even during difficult times.

One of the most recent innovations to hit the boating industry is the new hydraulic trailer made by Stanley Machine of Parry Sound. This device is revolutionizing the work of hauling boats, lifting them in and out of the water, allowing one man to do the work of loading or unloading boats of up to 20 tons.

On the subject of boats, let me point out that Canada 1, the yacht now being prepared for this fall's America's Cup, was built in Parry Sound.

Mr. Martel: Is that part of the BILD program?

Mr. Eves: Certainly.

Again though, let me show members another approach; the cynical, pessimistic attitude often displayed by our opposition counterparts. The NDP member for Scarborough West (Mr. R. F. Johnston) indicates in a recent story that Canadians have been deceived into believing there is a recovery. He calls this a cruel hoax and says if anything things are getting worse, not better. The evidence of improving attitudes and conditions in my own riding is enough to disprove that pessimistic evaluation and all we have to do is look at the facts.

What about the recall of the 11,000 workers in

Sudbury recently? What about the fact that only 3.4 per cent of Chrysler's workers are now on an indefinite layoff, compared to 39 per cent

What about the recall of the 11,000 workers in Sudbury recently? What about the fact that only 3.4 per cent of Chrysler's workers are now on an indefinite layoff, compared to 39 per cent in the United States?

I could quote a recent Globe and Mail article entitled "Promising Economy Remains In Rebuilding Stage." I could cite the fact that Canada's inflation rate has hit a new four-year low of 7.2 per cent. I could tell members the prime rate yesterday was cut to 11 per cent by all major chartered banks across Canada.

I can tell members in no uncertain terms that a belief in our government, its proposals and its leadership is one important reason so many of our communities continue to be optimistic and plan for the future in the face of current economic problems. They know the economy is turning around. They have faith in Ontario's future; they have faith in this government and in its leadership.

The Deputy Speaker: I am wondering if at this time the member for Parry Sound would like to move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. Eves: I have concluded my remarks, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

On motion by Ms. Copps, the debate was adjourned.

The House adjourned at 6 p.m.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, April 19, 1983

Statements by the ministry

Elgie, Hon. R. G., Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations:	
Trust companies.	17
Ramsay, Hon. R. H., Minister of Labour:	
Strikebreaking legislation.	17

Oral questions

Bennett, Hon. C. F., Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing:	
Ontario youth employment, Mr. Sweeney.	35
Birch, Hon. M., Provincial Secretary for Social Development:	
Closure of audio library, Mr. Allen, Mr. Van Horne.	33
Davis, Hon. W. G., Premier:	
Women's issues ministerial appointment, Mr. Rae, Mr. Peterson.	29
Constitutional property rights, Mr. Epp, Mr. Renwick.	34
Elgie, Hon. R. G., Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations:	
Sale of rental units, Mr. Peterson, Mr. Renwick.	25
Norcen Energy Resources Ltd., Mr. Roy, Mr. Renwick.	29
Pope, Hon. A. W., Minister of Natural Resources:	
Job transfers, Mr. Laughren.	36
Ramsay, Hon. R. H., Minister of Labour:	
Strikebreaking legislation, Mr. Rae, Mr. Wrye.	27
Timbrell, Hon. D. R., Minister of Agriculture and Food:	
Assistance to farmers, Mr. Riddell, Mr. Swart.	32
Walker, Hon. G. W., Minister of Industry and Trade:	
Closure of Chrysler plant, Mr. Cooke, Mr. Wrye.	35

Petitions

Closure of facilities for mentally retarded, Mr. Sheppard, tabled.	36
Fees for provincial parks, Mr. T. P. Reid, tabled.	36

Motions

House sittings, Mr. Wells, agreed to.	37
Business of the House, Mr. Wells, agreed to.	37
Deputy Chairman, Mr. Wells, agreed to.	37

First readings

Emergency Plans Act, Bill 2, Mr. G. W. Taylor, agreed to.	37
Motor Vehicle Dealers Amendment Act, Bill 3, Mr. Elgie, agreed to.	37
Collection Agencies Amendment Act, Bill 4, Mr. Elgie, agreed to.	37
Boilers and Pressure Vessels Amendment Act, Bill 5, Mr. Elgie, agreed to.	38
Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, Bill 6, Mr. Breithaupt, agreed to . .	38

Succession Law Act , Bill 8, Mr. Breithaupt, agreed to.	38
Election Amendment Act , Bill 9, Mr. Breithaupt, agreed to.	39
Legislative Assembly Amendment Act , Bill 10, Mr. Breithaupt, agreed to.	39
Landlord and Tenant Amendment Act , Bill 11, Mr. Philip, agreed to.	39
Labour Relations Amendment Act , Bill 12, Mr. Mackenzie, agreed to.	39

Private member's motion

Motion to set aside ordinary business , Mr. Mackenzie, Mr. Wrye, Mr. Ramsay, negatived .	40
---	----

Throne speech debate

Mr. Brandt	43
Mr. Eves	51

Other business

Commission on Election Contributions and Expenses , Mr. Speaker.	17
Visitor , Mr. Speaker.	25
Use of time in question period , Mr. Speaker.	25
Cambridge Hornets , Mr. Barlow.	40
Adjournment	54

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Allen, R. (Hamilton West NDP)
Barlow, W. W. (Cambridge PC)
Bennett, Hon. C. F., Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Ottawa South PC)
Birch, Hon. M., Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Scarborough East PC)
Boudria, D. (Prescott-Russell L)
Brandt, A. S. (Sarnia PC)
Breithaupt, J. R. (Kitchener L)
Conway, S. G. (Renfrew North L)
Cooke, D. S. (Windsor-Riverside NDP)
Cousens, D., Deputy Chairman and Acting Speaker (York Centre PC)
Cureatz, S. L., Deputy Speaker and Chairman (Durham East PC)
Davis, Hon. W. G., Premier (Brampton PC)
Elgie, Hon. R. G., Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (York East PC)
Epp, H. A. (Waterloo North L)
Eves, E. L. (Parry Sound PC)
Kerrio, V. G. (Niagara Falls L)
Laughren, F. (Nickel Belt NDP)
Mackenzie, R. W. (Hamilton East NDP)
Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
McClellan, R. A. (Bellwoods NDP)
Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
Peterson, D. R. (London Centre L)
Philip, E. T. (Etobicoke NDP)
Pope, Hon. A. W., Minister of Natural Resources (Cochrane South PC)
Rae, R. K. (York South NDP)
Ramsay, Hon. R. H., Minister of Labour (Sault Ste. Marie PC)
Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L-Lab.)
Renwick, J. A. (Riverdale NDP)
Riddell, J. K. (Huron-Middlesex L)
Roy, A. J. (Ottawa East L)
Sargent, E. C. (Grey-Bruce L)
Sheppard, H. N. (Northumberland PC)
Stokes, J. E. (Lake Nipigon NDP)
Swart, M. L. (Welland-Thorold NDP)
Sweeney, J. (Kitchener-Wilmot L)
Timbrell, Hon. D. R., Minister of Agriculture and Food (Don Mills PC)
Turner, Hon. J. M., Speaker (Peterborough PC)
Van Horne, R. G. (London North L)
Walker, Hon. G. W., Minister of Industry and Trade (London South PC)
Wrye, W. M. (Windsor-Sandwich L)



Hansard

Official Report of Debates

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Third Session, 32nd Parliament

Thursday, April 21, 1983

Speaker: Honourable John M. Turner

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

Contents of the proceedings reported in this issue of Hansard appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of the speakers taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is \$15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, Information Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 965-2238.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Thursday, April 21, 1983

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY

CONSTITUTIONAL PROPERTY RIGHTS

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to advise the House that the government of this province will introduce in the near future a resolution to authorize, from Ontario's standpoint, an amendment of the Canadian Constitution regarding property rights.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am always prepared to share, as long as members opposite, who always love to share a credit, will also share in the responsibility.

Mr. Bradley: You are the last one to lecture on that—you and the feds.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Listen, the feds are your party. Do not try to dissociate yourself from your federal brethren. Do not try to do it.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Interjections

Mr. Speaker: Now are we quite finished? Statements by the ministry.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I have to ask you, Mr. Speaker, in terms of credit, who will be there when the courthouse is open, who was there at the sod turning?

Mr. Bradley: The member for St. Catharines.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, come on, who are you kidding?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member is a Tory when I am in his riding.

Mr. Bradley: That is the worst insult I have ever had.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Interjections

Mr. Speaker: Statements by the ministry. The Premier.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I was interrupted, Mr. Speaker. I apologize.

The resolution will propose an amendment to section 7 of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms

so as to include a right to enjoyment of property and the right not to be deprived thereof except in accordance with the principles of fundamental justice.

Last month the first ministers met with native leaders in Ottawa to discuss aboriginal rights. Ministers and officials had earlier reviewed the resolution on entrenched property rights which passed unanimously in the British Columbia Legislature, and it was planned that the first ministers would consider the issue during their informal sessions in March.

Although agreement was not reached at that time, Ontario believes that the opportunity offered by the BC resolution should not be allowed to slip by. If within two and a half years Parliament and seven provincial legislatures with at least 50 per cent of the population pass similar resolutions, we will have entrenched property rights.

Interest in entrenched property rights is not new to either Canada or to this province. The protection of property rights has always been a feature of Canadian common law. In 1960 this tradition was expressed in statutory law. The Canadian Bill of Rights includes, as a human right and fundamental freedom, the words "enjoyment of property and the right not to be deprived thereof except by due process of law."

The Canadian Bill of Rights was introduced and led through the House of Commons by that great Canadian, John George Diefenbaker. I expect the benches opposite to applaud.

Mr. Kerrio: He flew it with the Arrow.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, the Arrow did fly. It did not fly long enough for my purposes.

Interjection.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I had to fight an election on the Avro Arrow. I thought it was grossly unfair.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think we should recall the history. With all due respect to the member for Waterloo North (Mr. Epp), I want to remind members of a little of the history.

In the draft Charter of Rights and Freedoms of July 1980, section 7 included a reference to property rights. By August 1980 the federal government had removed the enjoyment of

property from the Charter of Rights and Freedoms in response to concern from some of the sister provinces, primarily Saskatchewan and Prince Edward Island, which felt that such provisions could adversely affect their existing legislation respecting land ownership.

On January 23, 1981, during the deliberations of the joint Senate-House of Commons committee on the Constitution, Perrin Beatty of the Progressive Conservative Party moved an amendment to section 7 of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms to add "enjoyment of property." He was assured of government support for the amendment by the acting Minister of Justice at that time, Mr. Kaplan.

On January 26, 1981, the then Minister of Justice, Mr. Chrétien, appeared before the committee and withdrew the government support of the amendment, citing the opposition of many provinces. He also stated that Mr. Kaplan's consent was the result of a misunderstanding. I am not quarrelling with that. I think that is factually correct.

On January 27, 1981 the Progressive Conservative amendment in favour of property rights was voted down by the committee by a vote of 15 to eight. It is generally understood that this vote reflected the desire of the federal government to set this issue aside in the pursuit of a broader consensus among provinces and in Parliament. However, members will note that the Prime Minister has very recently reiterated his earlier willingness to see such a provision entrenched.

The reservations of some provinces have centred on the perceived limitation that such an entrenched guarantee would place on provincial responsibilities such as agricultural lands policy and expropriations. These are but two examples. It is our belief there will still be room for such important legislation. I do not think anyone wishes to intervene, say, in Prince Edward Island, in terms of how it perceives its land policies. It is a relatively small amount of real estate, and we are sympathetic to the concerns of that government that the land does not disappear into ownership in other places. As a result, my government will want to hear and discuss various positions on the implications that our resolution might have.

Members here will know—I know the member for Waterloo North in particular knows this—that this province has supported the inclusion of property rights in our Constitution since 1980. It was part of our position. The member reviewed it carefully, so I know he is aware that

was the position of the government. Because this principle is one of our fundamental freedoms, such as liberty or the security of the person, it is our intent, as I previously noted, to proceed with a resolution to have property rights included in section 7 of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

The charter aptly entrenches so much of what, by tradition, it has meant to be Canadian. Accordingly, it is very appropriate that the first two amendments, if this does carry in our sister provinces, to our new Constitution considered by this Legislature should be the recognition of the collective rights of aboriginal peoples and the individual right to enjoyment of property.

2:10 p.m.

BUDGET

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I would like to advise the House that I will present my budget on May 10 in the afternoon.

ONTARIO COMMISSION ON TRUCK SAFETY

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to table this afternoon the recently completed report of the Ontario Commission on Truck Safety.

It is almost exactly 18 months to the day since I announced in this House the appointment of Dr. Robert Uffen of Queen's University to carry out this independent study of truck safety on Ontario's roads. His mandate was sufficiently broad to allow him to investigate all noneconomic matters pertaining to truck safety, including driver standards, vehicle standards and specifications, rules of the road, enforcement and sanctions, as well as public and industry perceptions and expectations.

When Dr. Uffen reported to me two weeks ago that he had completed his report, I felt it should be brought to public attention as quickly as possible. I assure members that the copies are, as they say, hot off the press. In fact, they were received from the printer just within the last hour or so.

Although I have not had an opportunity to evaluate its content in detail, I can say that my initial reaction to both his report to me and his written text is that he has made a very comprehensive, thorough and detailed investigation of his subject.

To accomplish this, he held nine public hearings, seven of them two-day sessions, in major centres across the province. Between the presentations made at these hearings and those

sent directly to him, Dr. Uffen studied more than 80 briefs in addition to holding private interviews and considering the comments of interested groups from the industry and the general public.

As well, he arranged for a demonstration of the controversial overlength trucks. During the course of the demonstration he both rode in the cabs of these trucks and observed their operation on the highway and in traffic.

I point out these items only because I would like to emphasize that Dr. Uffen went to considerable lengths to accommodate the presentation of views from various levels of government, the industry and the public.

As a result of his intensive investigation, Dr. Uffen came up with a total of 61 recommendations. However, in the interest of highlighting the most important, he chose and expanded on what he considers the nine principal recommendations. A number of these pertain directly to the truck driver, his training, licensing, medical condition and driving habits. In addition, he highlights speed limits and following distances as well as a ring road for Metro Toronto, accident investigation procedures and overlength vehicles.

In outlining these nine principal recommendations, Dr. Uffen prefaced his comments with a statement which points out that most of the evidence indicates the major problem lies with human behaviour.

At this time I do not propose to elaborate any further on the report other than to say that Dr. Uffen will be meeting with the press this afternoon at 3:30 in the media studio to outline and comment on his report.

I believe that Dr. Uffen is with us today in the gallery. I thank you, Dr. Uffen, for being here with us.

In closing, I would like to say that his report adds a great deal to our knowledge and perceptions of truck safety. It also, in its thoroughness, calls for an in-depth study of the recommendations and possible implications. This will begin as soon as possible, and I propose to report back in due course when I have some concrete proposals to make in response to these recommendations. In the meantime, because this is a very important topic to a great many people, I will welcome any comments on the contents of the report from the public.

SERVICES FOR PRINT-HANDICAPPED STUDENTS

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, further

to the commitment made by my colleague the Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Mrs. Birch) that services such as those provided by the audio library at Trent will continue, I am pleased to announce, on behalf of the social policy field ministers, a plan for continuing the provision of Braille and audio textbook and reference material transcription services for Ontario's print-handicapped post-secondary students.

The W. Ross Macdonald School in Brantford has been designated as the provincial co-ordinating agency for Braille and audio educational materials production and dissemination. This includes educational materials for kindergarten to grade 13 and the post-secondary services which are the subject of my comments today.

The school will work closely with post-secondary institutions and with the agencies currently involved with Braille and audio transcription. These agencies, which include the audio library service at Trent University, the national library at the Canadian National Institute for the Blind, PAL Reading Services Inc. and the Braille Centre at the University of Western Ontario, have agreed to participate in such an arrangement.

The W. Ross Macdonald School will receive requests from post-secondary institutions on behalf of print-handicapped students, will search sources for previously transcribed materials and will arrange for transcription as required. Transcriptions will be done as part of an annual contract arrangement with the previously noted transcription services.

An advisory committee, with representation from the community college and university sectors, the service providers and users, will assist the W. Ross Macdonald School in considering program policy, standard formats and future directions for the service.

Community colleges and universities should continue to facilitate the provision of day-to-day educational materials for print-handicapped students in their institutions. Such materials may include class handouts, examinations and short reference articles.

For the next three to four months, until the W. Ross Macdonald School has developed fully its co-ordinating role, I have requested that all of the transcription services continue to work with students' requests as they have in the past. Funds will be provided directly to these agen-

cies in the interim period to continue their services to post-secondary students.

I should like to draw the attention of the members of the Legislature the enormous contribution made by hundreds of Ontario's citizens to the education of print-handicapped post-secondary students. The volunteer readers, the volunteer Braillists at the CNIB, at the audio library service and at PAL, and the volunteers at post-secondary institutions, provide an indispensable part of the continuing service for print-handicapped students.

VISITOR

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I just thought I might draw to your attention and to the attention of members that one of our former colleagues in the House is in the gallery today. I am sure you would like to welcome to the House the former member for Victoria-Haliburton, Glen Hodgson.

[Applause]

Mr. Conway: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: I was wondering whether the government House leader was going to make a statement today to remove any confusion and to perhaps obviate any embarrassment that might have been created for the royal household as a result of that part of the speech from the throne, the last paragraph on page 23, which gave rise to press accounts. This certainly indicated in the minds of many members of this Legislature that there is some confusion. I am sure the government House leader, to say nothing of the leader of the government, would not wish to—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That is not a point of order.

ORAL QUESTIONS

PHYSICIANS' FEES

Mr. Peterson: The Treasurer stated on several occasions that the participation of the doctors of the province in the restraint program was critical to the program's success. For example, just to quote from the September 24 North Bay Nugget, he said, "It will be important 'for the doctors to understand how the perception [of their status] is in society and how critical their reaction may be to the overall success of our program.'"

2:20 p.m.

I remind the Treasurer that this was some six months ago. Can he tell this House what has changed in the last six months, what has inter-

vened to make him take a different view that he can afford to pay out to the doctors, depending on one's figures, \$82 million, \$70 million or whatever, when six months ago he thought it so important that they participate in the restraint program?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I would be very glad to answer that, Mr. Speaker. Of course, the honourable member realizes that at the time I made that statement Bill 179 was before this House. We were faced at that point with delegations either coming or about to come before the committee. We were faced with many people working for various levels of government in this province having a restriction on their salaries. This government had said it hoped that the physicians, although they were not employees, would understand that this was a difficult distinction to make in the eyes of many and that their participation on some basis that would need to be voluntary would help us greatly to sell to those people affected by the legislation the sense of basic fairness of that legislation.

That legislation has passed. The member asks me what has changed. The legislation has passed, and I have to give great credit to the people who are covered by it because they have reacted in a totally responsible way in Ontario, co-operating with the people they work for, in helping us fight inflation.

Mr. Peterson: So that I understand the position, the government did not take a hard line with the doctors then because other people were coming in and talking in committee about that legislation and the government was hoping they would voluntarily submit at the time.

Why did things change? The minister felt so strongly at the time that doctors should be involved to give a sense of fairness to that legislation. He knows the bitterness that legislation caused. He knows he has the control and he has the power to put the Ontario health insurance plan fees under that legislation. He had the power then and he did not take advantage of it. Then he tried to jawbone them into it voluntarily, and they refused his offer, for which I do not blame them. How does the minister expect anybody to submit voluntarily?

How can he go back now to people who have submitted and say, "We are going to carry the burden of restraint on the backs of the orderlies, the nursing assistants and the custodians but not on the backs of the doctors," and ask them to do their bit? How can he suggest now that this is fair when it was not fair then?

Hon. F. S. Miller: It is always nice for a party that has three positions on this matter to stand up. Let me recall the three positions his party had. The member for London North (Mr. Van Horne) said they were worth more; the member for Hamilton Centre (Ms. Copps) said they were worth less; the Leader of the Opposition said he did not know what they were worth.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. McClellan: Mr. Speaker, now that the government has finally decided to honour its contract with the medical profession, unlike the contracts it has signed with its own employees, which it tore up, and unlike contracts with hospital workers, which it tore up, will the Treasurer now insist and take the necessary action to make sure that the doctors honour their end of the contract and charge one fee for medical services rendered to citizens of Ontario, and that is the OHIP fee, as in the terms of any normal contract?

Hon. F. S. Miller: My friend knows very well that was not part of the contract or the agreement as it stands. He knows that the right to opt out for a physician has existed in Ontario ever since health insurance was introduced. It was not part of that deal.

Mr. Peterson: Obviously, the Treasurer had trouble with the morality of the whole question and his pragmatic instincts prevailed; either that or he was mugged in cabinet by the Minister of Health (Mr. Grossman). Who knows what happened?

May I have the Treasurer's assurance he will not increase OHIP premiums and that he will not come back to this House as a rationalization, if he does try to raise OHIP premiums, and say to us, "We need them to pay the doctors more because we do not have money in the Treasury now"? Will he give us that guarantee now?

Hon. F. S. Miller: No.

Mr. Peterson: I could ask who is running the government, Mr. Speaker.

CLOSURE OF FACILITIES FOR THE MENTALLY RETARDED

Mr. Peterson: Let me ask a question of the Premier with respect to the closing of the centres for the retarded, of which he is very well aware. The Premier will recall discussions that were held during his estimates. I thought he demonstrated some sensitivity to the question then. As nearly as I can remember, he said he

was prepared to look at that question sensitively if perhaps the government had made a mistake.

The Premier is aware of the vast number of petitions that have been filed in this House, both from members on his side as well as members on this side. Some 20,000 signatures have now been filed by way of petition protesting against the closing of those centres for the retarded and, at the very least, asking for a moratorium to start the consultative process that was not in place when the plan to announce those closings was made.

Given all that has transpired since the last discussion in this House about that matter, will the Premier now consider the very thoughtful and, I believe, reasonable position of the parents involved in those centres to declare a moratorium and make sure there are no further closings, with no more residents shipped back to larger institutions, until there has been a full consultation program? Will the Premier use his good offices to declare that moratorium so we can at least have some thoughtful discussions on this whole matter?

Hon. Mr. Davis: This is a very sensitive area of government policy. I recognize this and I respect the concerns that have been expressed by a number of parents in a number of communities. In a personal way I have been rather closely associated with the programs for the mentally retarded ever since coming into this Legislature. I like to believe the policies of this government have not only been sensitive but in keeping with what we believe are the right directions to go.

I do not recall verbatim some of the discussions in the House because I did not research this at all, but my recollection is that when the government stated it was embarking upon a program of deinstitutionalization, if that is the right word for the approach that is being envisaged and what the ministry is doing, there was fairly general support for this as a matter of principle and of a philosophical nature. I regret it if the Leader of the Opposition is withdrawing what I sensed was his party's support for that general direction.

For those of us who represent smaller communities—and this is the case as it relates to some of these institutions—I think it is also realistic that there is a high emotional content, particularly when one is dealing with the parents of some of these people. I can speak with some knowledge of the sensitivity of the emotional feelings. I think the ministry has understood this. I have met directly in my own office

with some of the people involved and other members of my staff have had meetings as well.

Because there is a period of time for some of these institutions, the ministry has been working with the people in the community. As an example, I think the honourable member is aware of the ongoing discussions that have been taking place in Elgin county with the centre in St. Thomas, where there is probably now a relative degree of acceptance. The honourable member shakes his head, but that is the impression we have.

While I am not for a moment saying there is a moratorium, because that would be misleading, I can only say that the government intends to handle all of these five or six situations with sensitivity and to have discussions with parents and representatives within the community. We believe we are going in the right direction in terms of the principle of the policy, but no one minimizes the concern that is being expressed by the communities and, more particularly, by the parents of the people who are affected.

2:30 p.m.

Mr. Peterson: The Premier is aware we very well support the principle of deinstitutionalization, as do most members of the House, just as we support the monarchy, for example. We on this side of the House would never do anything to embarrass Her Majesty, but that is not the point.

The point is this: is the Premier aware that in closing the Brockville centre a number of those residents were shipped back to larger institutions? They went back to the Rideau Centre at Smiths Falls. Therefore, the Premier's stated aims of deinstitutionalization have not been carried out. We are taking people from medium-sized institutions that are working reasonably well to larger institutions that we all want to avoid, so the stated aim of the government's policy is not working.

Would the Premier reconsider what is transpiring in the light of those realities and in the light of the fact that we are not going to be able to have the group homes in place? There are problems with zoning in a variety of areas like Goderich.

Given those delays, will the Premier do the humane thing and call for a moratorium to make sure that everyone is satisfied that every single resident will be in the appropriate place when those centres are closed? Surely that is not an unreasonable request.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is a very difficult position for the ministry, because it is part of a longer

process. The difficulty the ministry has is explaining, say, to the parents that in community A—and let us stay away from the individual communities; I will not cite St. Thomas—there will be a facility or a home in place.

Quite obviously if I were a parent and I saw the physical structure there, if I knew the accommodation was there, it would be more acceptable. Surely the Leader of the Opposition must understand that in order to bring this about one has to make certain decisions and then one implements the program in a sensitive fashion.

I do not think there is any contradiction. I am not the expert in this—I really wish the Leader of the Opposition would direct his more particular questions to the minister—but I have some sensitivity as to the general issues.

Once again, not referring to the people in St. Thomas, if the member would regard Cedar Springs as a larger institution, which it is in terms of size, if he has assessed the programs—and perhaps he has—and the physical accommodation in Cedar Springs I think he will find that while it is a larger institution in his definition of the word, it is none the less an excellent institution.

I do not believe there is a contradiction in the policy of deinstitutionalization. The fact that a person is being moved from what is a relatively small institution to a larger institution does not limit the program or the care for these people because of its size. I say that very advisedly. I know there are shortcomings in every institution dealing with issues of this nature, but in any objective assessment, whether it is of the Rideau Centre, Cedar Springs, whatever, I take some pride in thinking this province is operating first-class facilities for this important part of our population.

Mr. R. F. Johnston: Mr. Speaker, does the Premier not recognize that in making the major step in deinstitutionalization that has been made it is important to adhere to the basic principle of deinstitutionalization? That is, no one from these institutions should be going to another institution. We should be getting them all into the community and providing that kind of assistance to them.

Will the Premier not accept that as an important principle and that the statement about sending people back to Rideau at this point is making many parents afraid that it is their children who will be going back to other institutions and not into the community in a real deinstitutionalization?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am not an expert. I cannot say what is the best in terms of every single young person or a mature person in this group. I cannot answer that question.

I cannot honestly say to the member that every person who is now in one of our institutions, whether it be small or large, should be totally within the community. I am not sure that the interest of the patient, if that is the right word to use, is necessarily best served by this. I think one has to look at them almost individually and try to determine what is the best program and location for that individual.

I am delighted, though, to sense that at least this honourable member supports the concept of deinstitutionalization and that his objections may relate to the fact, not as to the closing of some of these but as to where the present patients or occupants ultimately may go.

That is one of the difficulties, as I tried to explain to the Leader of the Opposition. It is difficult for the ministry to invest in or to develop, shall we say, the much smaller community facility if it is not in a position to say that if we invest in that we are doing so because this larger facility will be closing.

I guess it is a question of what comes first. Do we build it first and then say, "Here we are," or do we say to the parents: "This is the direction we are going. You have the assurance of the government that patients are not going to be moved where we have said there will be other facilities until those facilities are there"? That is the general approach we are taking.

I really do wish the member would ask the minister in a more particular sense, because I know of the general issue but I cannot give him the specifics.

Mr. Peterson: I must say I have real difficulty understanding what the Premier is saying. He is saying that moving people from a small institution to a large institution is deinstitutionalization.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I did not say that.

Mr. Peterson: It is not deinstitutionalization? I will check Hansard. Perhaps someone else in the room understood what he is talking about. I really do not.

Let me ask this question. The Premier is aware that a number of the residents in the medium-sized institutions had been in larger institutions—Cedar Springs, Huronia, Smiths Falls—and he is aware that the medium-sized institution was seen as an intermittent step towards the general objective of being out in the community in the small group home. But he is

also aware, I am sure, that a number of residents have not been able to function in that community setting. I have talked with many parents who have had a lot of individual difficulties.

Would the Premier just stop, pause a bit and reassess what he is doing in consultation with each individual parent so he will be satisfied and they will be satisfied that the paramount factor will be the needs of each individual resident, not some grand program of either institutionalization or deinstitutionalization, whatever we want to call it, that has no particular relevance to the individuals concerned?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I regret that the honourable member had difficulty understanding what I was attempting to explain. I will assume responsibility for that, although I think there are several other members of the House who did understand.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Name one.

Mr. Speaker: Never mind the interjections, please.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I have a feeling the member for Scarborough West (Mr. R. F. Johnston) understood what I was saying. He may not agree with it.

May I point out a contradiction to the Leader of the Opposition? He is saying to me that he is in favour of deinstitutionalization, that he does not want some of these people going back into the larger centres, at the same time as he says that some of them are not comfortable with a smaller community orientation. He cannot have it both ways.

What is also relevant is not just the philosophy of deinstitutionalization but a recognition that some institutions will still be necessary for a period of time until we reach whatever the ultimate solution may be, and what is relevant for those people is the quality of the program.

I do not happen to be as up to date, for instance on Cedar Springs, as I was four or five years ago, but with respect to the program and the facility itself the member should understand it is probably one of the best that any government can develop anywhere in this country, and to say we should not have people go there shows a certain lack of judgement on his part which is consistent with some of his other views on some other issues.

PHYSICIANS' FEES

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health. In the light of the fact that as a result of the settlement he signed with the

doctors last year, in 1984-85 the average income of a physician in this province will be \$122,000, does he not feel this is sufficient income for the physicians of this province and that as a result of this settlement there should now be no extra billing carried on in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, for most of the physicians in this province I feel that the average income, which is what it is, is appropriate. However, of course, when one considers the fact that there is nothing in the Ontario health insurance plan schedule of benefits or in the Ontario Medical Association schedule—which, as the honourable member knows, the OHIP schedule tracks—to reflect merit, to reflect years of service or to reflect competence—

Mr. R. F. Johnston: There isn't here in the Legislature either.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Obviously, or else you would really be starving.

2:40 p.m.

Mr. Rae: Why don't you stay on the point.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I know you are sweating a little bit today, Robert; now just hear the answer.

If that schedule were flexible enough we would be in a position where the continent's leading specialists and surgeons would be able to earn—let me say it quite openly—what I consider to be an appropriate amount of money for the 10 or 15 years when they are at the top end of their competence and ability. Those would be their years between perhaps 40 and 53 or 54. Yet there is nothing in the fee schedule that allows us to pay those doctors, frankly, more than the income the member cited.

So one of the problems with the system is that the schedule that is currently in place is flat in the sense that the young person who graduated yesterday makes the same and earns the same as a person who is at the absolute height of his or her professional competence. The reality is that for some of those surgeons the figure cited is less than they are worth here, I would suggest, and certainly in other parts of the world.

Unless we are prepared to face up to the reality that some of those people will decide to leave Ontario, as many of them in fact decided to leave Quebec a few years ago and have been lost to Canada, we will be accepting the proposition that we would rather have everyone opted in with a lower quality of medicine than some people opted out providing the highest quality of medicine that is available anywhere in the world.

That is the circumstance we have today. I would say to the honourable leader of the third party, the benefit of it is that the better-off in society pay the freight for those—

Mr. Speaker: That was a very complete answer. Supplementary?

Mr. Rae: That is a nonsensical answer. The figure I gave is an average and the minister knows perfectly well that virtually every specialist in Ontario is making well above that average figure. The minister is well aware of that fact and the average takes that into consideration.

Anyway, last week he was talking about there being too many doctors and the fact that they are all flooding into Ontario and now he is parading this horror about how they are going to flood out again. What a load of malarkey.

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

Mr. Rae: The Catholic Health Conference of Ontario, the Ontario Association of Professional Social Workers, the Medical Reform Group, the Patients' Rights Association, the Registered Nurses Association of Ontario, the United Senior Citizens of Ontario and the Consumers' Association of Canada, Ontario chapter, in the briefs they have presented to the minister for the conference he is holding next week, all have said they are opposed to extra billing.

I would like to ask the minister how many consultations it will take before the government comes to terms with the fact that the vast majority of citizens and health care professionals in this province think extra billing is unacceptable in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Might I say to those who perhaps did not have an opportunity to read and study my remarks with regard to numbers of doctors over the weekend, what I was referring to, of course, and what I made quite explicit at that time—and indeed the member's Health critic has heard me talk about it and could have informed his leader with regard to the problem—was that the problem is we would lose the doctors we need to keep and in some areas—

Mr. Stokes: Prove to the people in northern Ontario that there are too many doctors.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The member for Lake Nipigon is quite right, we do not have enough. Overall, we have too many, but I do not want to lose our best and I am not prepared to lose our best for the sake of having something that the member philosophically finds more comfortable, which is lowest-common-denominator medicine.

Mr. Foulds: Why are you not in medicine, then?

Mr. Rae: If that were true, the minister would be practising.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Let me also say I understand the problem. The Ontario Federation of Labour told the members opposite to tell us not to roll back the doctors; I understand.

In direct answer to the latter question, and there were two, as to how many briefs it will take from groups such as the member for York South has named to convince us to end extra billing in this province, might I say those very groups, almost all of which In direct answer to the latter question, and there were two, as to how many briefs it will take from groups such as the member for York South has named to convince us to end extra billing in this province, might I say those very groups, almost all of which I have met, have all indicated that the burden of taxation upon their people—be it retail sales tax, be it income tax, be it OHIP premiums—is very significant.

One of the things those people would quite justifiably complain about would be the consequence of what we might call the Emmett Hall formula which the member's party supported last year. Let us make it clear, that formula would end up paying those doctors more through an opted-in OHIP schedule of benefits. There is only one place for that money to come from. It is not only from the rich in society who are extra-billed. It would be from the retail sales tax base. It would be from the liquor, alcohol, all the other taxes that very many people at the lower economic bracket happen to pay.

Ms. Copps: What about OHIP premiums?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: And OHIP premiums.

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, it is obvious the minister was somewhat chagrined yesterday when despatched from cabinet by the Premier to announce to the waiting press in the hall this very embarrassing decision that the government has made not to include the doctors in the restraint program. As I understand him to have said yesterday, the government's program now, its plan now, is to pay the doctors back in the next negotiating period for them not voluntarily submitting to the restraint program now.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I understand the Leader of the Opposition likes to threaten and operate that way. He really wanted to get on the radio this morning and punish the docs. I understand that, but we do not operate that way over here.

Might I say though, the member asked whether I was sent out and he said it was an embarrassing situation. What I call an embarrassing situation is the one the member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Kerrio) found himself in when he told—I do like to follow the meanderings of the Liberal members—the members of the Ontario Medical Association in Niagara Falls on April 8 that basically he was against rolling back the docs. That is what he told them. Now that is embarrassing.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Bellwoods.

Interjections.

Mr. McClellan: I was sure I heard a point of privilege from somewhere. It must have been an echo.

Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, I would like to ask—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Let us hear the question please.

Mr. McClellan: I would like to ask the minister, who keeps repeating the totally—

Mr. Kerrio: I am not embarrassed I said it.

Mr. McClellan: I cannot even hear myself.

Mr. Speaker: No, I know.

Mr. Kerrio: On a matter of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: No, there is no privilege, no.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order. There is no point of privilege. The member for Bellwoods.

Mr. McClellan: I would like to ask the minister—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Now, if we are quite finished, the member for Bellwoods.

Mr. McClellan: I would like to ask the minister, who keeps repeating the totally false and preposterous statement that only the rich are being extra-billed—he repeated it again today; it is totally false and he knows it—if he would share with us the data, which undeniably he has if he is concerned that the average net takehome pay of general practitioners and surgeons, which will be \$122,000 a year by the end of 1985, is inadequate for the doctors who are worth more money.

2:50 p.m.

Would he be so kind as to tell us what his officials estimate will be the average net takehome pay of an obstetrician by the end of 1985, since 65 per cent of the obstetricians are opted out in

Toronto and presumably are free to charge up to 40 per cent and in some cases 100 per cent above the OHIP fee schedule; and would he tell us perhaps what the average net takehome pay of a general surgeon will be at the end of 1985 and what the average pay of an anaesthetist will be?

Mr. Speaker: I think we will just deal with the first one, the obstetrician.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Obviously, to the extent that extra billing involves a free market decision with regard to the patients and what they are prepared to pay for those services, I could not estimate what the price of that service will be in 1985 any more than the member could estimate what the price of a litre of gasoline may be.

Mr. Rae: It is nice to know that private profit medicine is alive and well in Tory Ontario. [Later]

Mr. Kerrio: May I present my point of privilege now?

Mr. Speaker: I will listen to you now.

Mr. Kerrio: Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health made a statement that he suggested was something I said in a meeting I had with the doctors of Niagara Falls. I am afraid the minister did not relate everything that was said at the meeting.

My position was very clear to the good doctors of Niagara Falls. The fact of the matter is that we did have a meeting so they could put their position to myself and the federal minister. In fact, the point was being made more to the federal minister, because Mme Bégin is talking about not letting the doctors opt out and of course they wanted a meeting so that such a thing should not happen to them.

My participation had to do with meeting with them and telling them that I felt the same way as our party did when we debated the bill, and that was that everyone in this great province should participate in the restraint program, those gentlemen as well as the rest of us.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I should take this opportunity to admit that I did not recite fully, as the member for Niagara Falls mentioned, everything he said. To clarify the record, he said further: "Basically I am in agreement"—

Mr. Nixon: What are you quoting from?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: From his remarks. "Basically I am in agreement, because I am in private enterprise and am on the right wing of caucus"—it gets better—"and influential in being a

moderating force against people like Sheila Coppins."

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This is quickly degenerating into a debate. I think you have both made your points very well. I have listened patiently and I have failed to identify a point of privilege.

Mr. Kerrio: Mr. Speaker, if you are going to allow—

Mr. Speaker: No, no. Order, please.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: I think I gave you the opportunity of refuting fully what was said about your position. The minister chose to respond with a further quotation. This could go on all afternoon. I am not prepared to allow that, because we have other pressing business before this chamber.

CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO WORK

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, my question to the Premier has to do with property rights. As the Premier is aware, plants are closing across this province and a great many workers are being laid off. I am sure the Premier will appreciate that a great many of those workers feel they have a kind of property right in their job.

In the light of what is happening in this province, the number of layoffs that are taking place and the tremendous insecurity that is out there as a result of this very serious recession that is taking place, I wonder if the Premier would consider adding the words "livelihood" and "shelter" to the property rights concept which he wants to entrench in the Constitution and which we are quite prepared to support.

Given that we are writing a Constitution for 20th century Ontario, does he not believe that workers are also entitled to protection and to natural justice and fundamental justice with respect to their jobs and their protection, and that tenants are entitled to that same kind of protection as well?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think we have to be realistic and practical. I was one of those in support of a very all-encompassing preamble to the Constitution, which was not accepted. Now that goes back several years, where many of these hopes were expressed in such a preamble.

I think the senior citizen from Riverdale, who has now moved into the second row of that party's benches—and I would say to the member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick) that we over here respect senior citizens. He would have had

the second seat in the front row over here any time at all. He would have, without any question. He would be right next door to the member for Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry (Mr. Villeneuve) and he could not have a better seatmate.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Dealing with this in a realistic fashion, I think all of us would like to express the philosophy or the hope that not only workers but some might even say politicians have security of employment. The leader of the third party and I both know that will never be the case, nor should it be the case in terms of people in our profession. Certainly as far as some of those members are concerned we are doing our best to see that their tenure is very brief, but that is part of the process. He understands that and I do.

To include this in the Constitution in a way that I guess he would then suggest should be legally enforceable in law, I think he recognizes the practical limitations of doing that. No one is quarrelling with the general idea that all of us should have gainful employment and that all of us want shelter. Those are commendable objectives, objectives which this government is striving to achieve, but I really question the wisdom of putting it into a charter.

Mr. Rae: I hope the Premier is not suggesting that because we are putting property rights into the Constitution it means everybody in the country is necessarily going to want to, or in all circumstances be able to, exercise that right of ownership. The Premier has trivialized the issue and trivialized the comparison. Surely the point is that people should not be deprived of their jobs and of shelter without due process of law.

Given the fact that his government has dropped its commitments to improvements in severance pay legislation and improvements in legislation on unfair dismissal, how does he expect the workers of this province or the tenants of this province or people who are affected by this kind of insecurity—farmers and everybody else—to take seriously his concern about their property rights?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I suggest the next time the leader of the third party has lunch in the Sanssouci room with the president of the Ontario Federation of Agriculture he tells him the New Democratic Party is opposed to putting property rights into the charter.

Mr. Rae: I never said that. Point of order, Mr. Speaker—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Epp: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary to the Premier. First of all, I want to thank him for making the statement today. But given the fact that a good number of the provinces are led by the Premier's Conservative colleagues across the country—

Hon. Mr. Ashe: Not too many of them are led by Liberals anyway.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Epp:—and given the fact that he has had over the last number of years an opportunity to discuss this same measure with his colleagues the Premiers of different provinces, can we conclude that all those governments will now support in their own legislatures the entrenchment of property rights? Could the Premier indicate to us that he expects those provinces will support a similar resolution in their own provinces?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I really do not think the honourable member expects me to give the answer he would like me to give. I understand his references to Progressive Conservative governments in different parts of Canada and a growing recognition on his part that within the next 18 months there will be a Progressive Conservative government in charge in Ottawa. I understand that feeling.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Is the Premier prepared to comment on the question at hand?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am, but I thought a part of the question from the member for Waterloo North was whether I knew there were a number of provinces where they had the enlightened instincts to elect a Conservative government. Was that not part of the question?

Mr. Speaker: No, that was—

Mr. Nixon: No.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I heard that.

I shall answer very briefly and seriously. I cannot commence to speculate on the attitude of other governments. We know what British Columbia has done. There have been some discussions, but I cannot say what other governments will do.

Mr. Rae: Just for the record, I want the Premier to know that we in our party believe so strongly in private property that we think every-

body should have some and not just the banks and the mortgage companies.

I would simply like to ask the Premier, does he not think the workers of this province whose jobs are threatened and who do not have protection with respect to unfair dismissal or with respect to adequate severance pay legislation, the farmers of this province, the tenants of this province and the many people who need shelter and who do not have shelter should be able to have the same kinds of legal protection as do those people with property rights as they have been defined up to the present time? Does he not think those people should have fundamental rights protected in our Constitution as well?

Hon. Mr. Davis: As I read the charter, I think "fundamental rights" are protected in the Constitution. I think the member is stretching it in his views on dismissal. I think that is a valid area for discussion and debate, but to include in the Constitution a set of economical parameters that are unrealistic is really not the job of a charter or a constitution.

While I do not have many farmers in my riding, I have far more in my riding than the member has in his, and I can still say in this House that while they are concerned about many other things, a lot of the farmers in my constituency want their property rights in the Constitution.

3 p.m.

CONVERSION OF RENTAL UNITS

Mr. Ruprecht: Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations. The minister is no doubt aware that the newest trick being employed by landlords to evict tenants and raise rents illegally is the nominal conversion of apartments into supposed hotel units. In the case of 200 Jameson Avenue in my riding, of the 97 units in the building that have been furnished and are now being advertised as hotel units, the landlord applied to the Residential Tenancy Commission for rent increases for only 48 units in the building, claiming the other 39 units were hotel suites and therefore not subject to review. The commission disagreed with the landlord's interpretation and the matter is now being appealed.

Before an avalanche of similar cases emerges, will the minister request that the board of commissioners of the Residential Tenancy Commission amend its guidelines to ensure that landlords cannot escape from the rent review

process by merely furnishing empty units and calling them hotel suites?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, the important part of the question is the point that the issue has been appealed and it will be adjudicated by the appeal board. Therefore, it would be inappropriate for me to make any comment on it. I am sure the honourable member knows there are several other units related to the same ownership that are also under appeal at present, the commissioner initially having rejected the claim.

I am sure the member understands that there is a commission of inquiry sitting now reviewing matters related to rent review. I am certain that is a matter the commissioner will take into his consideration. It will be drawn to his attention.

Mr. Ruprecht: I do not think for one minute that it is inappropriate for the minister to comment on this issue. He is entrusted with a responsibility to protect tenants. That is the issue here.

The appeal hearing for 200 Jameson Avenue had originally been scheduled for March 31. It gets more complicated. It was postponed because the landlord wanted to amend his notice of appeal. On comparing the amended notice of appeal to the original one, it is clear the landlord has changed his approach.

Originally he disputed the commission's finding that the furnished units were rental units. On the amended notice the landlord states that the furnished units are rental units but that they have not been used as such for a period of at least 12 months prior to the commission's hearing. Precisely, that is the point.

I want to know from the minister what steps he is prepared to take. Perhaps he can tell us that today. If he is not prepared to intervene in the specific instance of 200 Jameson Avenue, which we have now made public, when will he intervene to protect the tenants in all of Ontario in this situation?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: This was a matter that was discussed at some length in committee last year. The member knows full well that this Legislature, when there was a minority government, did pass section 4 which provided for an exemption with respect to transient accommodation. He knows that the matters go before a commissioner for review. If he is suggesting that I should put myself into the place of the commissioner and direct him as to what to do, I have to tell the member I do not do that.

With respect to the protection of tenants' interests, I do not think there is anyone in this

province who does not understand that this is what I am doing.

JOB CREATION

Mr. Cooke: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Treasurer. He is quoted in today's press as saying, "I challenge anyone to show there was not enough money in the federal budget for job creation." How can the Treasurer make such a silly comment when the federal budget says the unemployment rate this year will be 12.4 per cent? Next year it will be over 11 per cent, and it will be over 10 per cent until 1986.

Is the Treasurer satisfied that the \$1.2 billion in the federal budget in the coming year is adequate to address the employment crisis? Can he assure us that he will take the employment crisis more seriously in his provincial budget than Mr. Lalonde has in his budget?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I learned long ago to look at the context of a quote. Those words, "I challenge anybody," do not sound like me. They easily could be me, and I could hear them back on a tape in the middle of one of the scrum discussions, but I do not recall even having that general thrust in my comments.

When somebody asked me if I would be spending more or whether there was enough, I think the words I used were something like "I challenge anybody to tell me how much is enough," or some words of that nature, because I really do not know how much is enough in this world.

It is very difficult to say what form the \$4.8 billion that Mr. Lalonde referred to will take. It depends on whether one uses his pre-leak or after-leak figures. His \$4.8 billion was actually aimed at both tax benefits and direct capital works programs. I think roughly \$2.4 billion was aimed at capital works programs and \$2.4 billion at some forms of stimulation of the private sector.

I have some difficulty in being able to translate exactly any method of proof that takes \$2.4 billion of tax benefits and says it caused so many jobs. That is where the kind of challenge was being mounted.

Mr. R. F. Johnston: Mr. Speaker, the minister will recognize that budget is spread over a four-year period and that unemployment is going to remain at the levels stated by the member for Windsor-Riverside (Mr. Cooke). Does the minister not find that intolerable? He has received letters from me and a second one which I passed on to him from one Jim Burkitt, who said the following:

"So I am currently living a limbo-like existence at the present time, searching for a job that will allow me to exist. Indeed, I don't see too much of a future, other than one that would allow for basic existence. I am thankful that I do not have a family to support. I can imagine the humiliation and exasperation of a man or a woman that has to explain joblessness to his children."

Does the minister not think that, as Treasurer, it is unacceptable to say that we will allow a continuation of 12 per cent unemployment so people like this man will continue to suffer over the next four years? Will he not today commit himself to having a major job creation component—direct job creation—by his government in his budget?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I would suspect if he asked, as I have been asking a lot of people around Ontario, where they really think jobs are best created, most would still say not in those major government job direct creation projects but somehow out there in small business and hopefully in big business, where the jobs not only provide an income for a family but also some addition to the gross product of this nation that can be shared by all of us, either through the tax system or some other route.

Government job creation activities are always important. No matter what members on the other side of the House may say, we have a very good record of having intervened in a bad year, 1982, with an effort which on a per year basis is at least equal to the figures Mr. Lalonde used over four years. One of the favourite new tricks of the federal government is to make everything for four or five years; so the figure used sounds great. If one uses it three or four times in the same speech, no one will know what it is.

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, the Treasurer has some reservations, I gather, about public programs to create jobs. This is reflected in the actual numbers of jobs he will be creating through his programs this year, through the Ontario youth employment program and Experience '83. In fact, he will produce 16,300 fewer jobs this year than he did a year ago, even though we are facing record unemployment of 233,000 young people between the ages of 15 and 24, some 22.2 per cent.

Since he believes the private market should take up these jobs, can he tell us how many jobs he is going to create through the private market, with any help he is prepared to render? What are his targets?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, my target, of course, is a job for every able-bodied man and woman in this province who is seeking one. That is the only legitimate target of any government. The big difference is how to do it. I suggest to the honourable member again that the people of this province have a great deal more faith in the government of Ontario's ability to deal with their problems than it has in the federal government's or, indeed, his.

3:10 p.m.

ACID RAIN

Mr. J. A. Reed: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Natural Resources. Can the minister indicate what studies are being done by his ministry to determine whether the maple killback in the Parry Sound area is related to acid rain? Will he tell the House whether he now can table an inventory of that kill?

Hon. Mr. Pope: Mr. Speaker, I will attempt to get that information for the honourable member if it is yet available and get back to him when it is ready.

Mr. J. A. Reed: Will the minister also report to the House as to what level of investigation is taking place? In other words, how seriously does his ministry take this maple killback? Is he liaising with other parts of Canada that are experiencing a similar phenomenon? Is he also, through his ministry, liaising on the research work that is apparently being done in Europe to determine whether acid rain is actually killing off maple forests?

Hon. Mr. Pope: Both as the Ministry of Natural Resources and as a government through the Ministry of the Environment, we do have a research and scientific relationship with European jurisdictions. I happen to believe that Ontario and Canadian jurisdictions lead the way in this kind of scientific research, and I will be pleased to share that information with the member.

Mr. Laughren: Mr. Speaker, when the minister is replying to the honourable member who just asked the question, will he also reply to my question of yesterday about the loss of two jobs in the Huntsville sign shops of the Ministry of Natural Resources?

Hon. Mr. Pope: Mr. Speaker, my answer is contained in my letter to the honourable member, dated April 7, 1983, of which he knew when he asked the question yesterday.

MINIMUM WAGE

Mr. Samis: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour, by which I would like to switch the focus from the \$122,000 doctors to the working poor of Ontario.

Can the minister tell this House why in the past 18 months he has failed to do anything to improve the minimum wage in this province when within that same period of time his government has increased welfare benefits, Family Benefits Act benefits, Workers' Compensation Board benefits and pension supplement benefits? He has done nothing. Why?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, the matter of the minimum wage has been under review in our ministry. I remind the honourable member that the minimum wage in Ontario is the same as the federal minimum wage. At the moment we have no plans to raise it.

Mr. Samis: Can the minister tell the House and the working poor of this province why the minimum wage in this province is the lowest in all of mainland Canada? Why are we below such have-not provinces as Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: The member has to take into consideration the difficult times in which employers and employees are during this recession.

WHITE FARM EQUIPMENT

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Industry and Trade, having to do with the status of White Farm Equipment in Brantford. He may recall that about a year ago this House approved a combination of grants and loans of about \$5.5 million for the company. Can he explain to the House why, with that sort of support, the company employment has fallen from about 1,000 to a mere handful of custodians and one or two office workers?

Can he comment on rumours in the community that the company is about to cease functioning altogether?

Hon. Mr. Walker: Mr. Speaker, all I can say to the honourable member is that the entire industry is really down and has been down for some time. The anticipated turnaround expected just a short while ago did not occur, and the industry certainly has continued to be in a very difficult state ever since. That is true whether one looks at Massey-Ferguson, at White Farm Equipment or even at John Deere, which in terms of profitability is probably the most successful one at the moment; but even that

firm is down substantially, with a substantial number of people on layoff.

White Farm Equipment has only 146 people working there now out of the total number that could have been there. That number is very unfortunate. International Harvester is having a lot of difficulty now and is basically on partial shutdown. In essence, the firm is not going to be producing in a short while; so there is a period of shutdown. We hope it will get back.

All we can do is hope that the entire industry does return. One has to relate it to interest rates; one has to relate it to commodity prices; one has to relate it simply to the ability of farmers to buy the equipment that is there, and all of us know some of the difficulties that the farming communities across the world have gone through.

I simply have to say to the member that all we can do is hope for a restoration of the industry. If that happens, it will obviously mean a restoration of the employment levels, including that of White Farm Equipment; if it does not materialize soon enough, then it is going to mean some very difficult times for some of the industries.

Mr. Nixon: Since the minister was one of the people who was in a position to approve or disapprove the American buyout a year ago, is he negotiating with any of the American owners or their representatives for any more financial or other types of assistance? And is he not aware that Massey has brought back one full shift and is turning out combines, although White seems to have made no effort whatsoever to continue any sort of production or even to stimulate sales?

Hon. Mr. Walker: It is conceivable that there could be some discussions going on between people at White and people within the ministry, but to my knowledge we are not negotiating with the American owners. When this was subject to discussion last year, as the member will recall, the only alternative to the agreement then entered into would have been the complete closure of the industry. That being the case, I think even the member would have found it unacceptable.

Mr. Nixon: That was not the only alternative.

Hon. Mr. Walker: That, I think, was the case.

Mr. Foulds: Mr. Speaker, in his first answer to the previous questioner, the minister enunciated four major firms that had suffered severe losses in jobs and employment creation opportunities. What happened to his commitment, when he assumed this portfolio, that his top priority was going to be jobs, jobs and more

jobs? Are the only jobs he has created those nine in the factory in southwestern Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Walker: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member should not be asking how badly Ontario is doing; he should be saying how well it is doing, given the fact that the entire world economy is down. I think he is the one who is merely making a fuss over it.

If one looks at the level of unemployment that Ontario has sustained, if that is the only way to measure it, it ranks infinitely better in comparison with all the industrial states that surround us; they wish they had our problems. The problem with the member opposite is that he looks at everything with a black cloud. For a change, why does he not look at something and say we should be giving some support to the economy, some support to business? When he starts doing that, people will give the members opposite more credence.

Mr. Laughren: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker: I wonder whether you could have the Minister of Industry and Trade pass on what he just said to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Ramsay) in view of the Minister of Labour's comments about not being able to raise the minimum wage.

FUEL TAX ACT REGULATIONS

Mr. Breaugh: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Revenue, who on several occasions now has had the complexity of the manner in which taxes are collected in Ontario questioned in the Legislature and in the courts.

I want to refer him to the latest report of the standing committee on regulations and other statutory instruments, on this occasion talking about the Fuel Tax Act, 1981, and Ontario Regulation 772/82. If I might just quote briefly, the committee said, "The refund is made to the middle man in the transaction, and the committee can find no statutory authority in the three extracts quoted above or elsewhere to authorize such a provision in the regulation."

When is the minister going to make this process legal?

Hon. Mr. Ashe: Mr. Speaker, I am reluctant to respond to that question without having the particular reference and the regulations in front of me. If the honourable member will provide them to me, I will be happy to get back to him. I can appreciate the concern, and I will be happy to respond in due course.

Mr. Breaugh: The minister has had it brought to his attention on several occasions now that

the legality of the techniques used to collect taxes has been challenged, particularly when the government is very fond of using retailers, for example, to collect the tax on a particular product. That has been challenged, and we are interested in knowing when the minister is going to make this process, of which he is so fond, a legal process.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: The last statement by the member is incorrect. The process of the collection of sales tax at the distributor or wholesale level, in the case of motor vehicle fuels and tobacco tax, has not been challenged in the recent reference. It was a case of prosecution for illegally importing cigarettes from another jurisdiction. The defence used that and the judge threw out our charges on the basis of that, but it was not a challenge per se.

Frankly, we see no great problems from that. If there are any, we have an obligation to protect the revenues of the province and of the people of Ontario and we will do so if need be.

3:20 p.m.

DEATHS AT HOSPITAL FOR SICK CHILDREN

Ms. Copps: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker: In view of the article in this morning's Toronto Star and in view of various news reports with respect to the calling of a public inquiry into the investigations at the Hospital for Sick Children, I wonder when we can expect a statement on this matter from either the minister involved or the government.

Mr. Speaker: I think you should put that question at the appropriate time.

Mr. McClellan: Mr. Speaker, speaking to the same point of privilege, it is a matter of real concern to members of this assembly that repeatedly, time and time again, matters dealing with the Hospital for Sick Children and other urgent questions have been released to the Toronto Star and other newspapers, but particularly the Star for some reason, before commitments that have been made to this assembly have been honoured.

Mr. Speaker: I have to rule that is not a proper point of privilege.

Mr. O'Neil: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Foulds: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: We already have one. Sorry.

CAPITAL GRANTS FOR EDUCATION

Mr. O'Neil: Mr. Speaker, the members on this side of the Legislature thought the Minister of

Education (Miss Stephenson) might be releasing to all members this afternoon the capital grants for the different boards of education across the province. I wonder whether that information is going to be provided today.

Mr. Speaker: Obviously she did not, and I have no way of knowing whether she will or will not. Maybe we could—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Maybe we could all wait until tomorrow.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order. That question should more properly have been placed during question period.

Mr. Boudria: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Education has permitted other cabinet ministers to announce today the capital grants for education in my riding. That minister is here right now.

Mr. Speaker: Order. That is not a point of privilege.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Foulds: If I may say so, Mr. Speaker, I have an extremely urgent and serious point of order. I wonder whether it is too late to move that the ordinary business of the House be set aside so that the exchange between the Minister of Health and the member for Niagara Falls—

Mr. Speaker: You are indeed too late.

PETITIONS

INDIAN FISHING RIGHTS

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Speaker, I have a petition on Indian fishing rights, addressed to the Minister of Natural Resources, which states:

"The Conservative government of Ontario has signed an agreement with the status Indians of Ontario giving them the right to harvest fish at any time of year by whatever means without a licence or authorization. Also, certain lakes will be zoned such that they will be reserved for the exclusive use of Indian people.

"Should the federal government sign this pact, it will become law and cannot be terminated for at least five years. If the agreement is signed, it cannot be produced or referred to before a court except for the purpose of enforcing the provisions of the agreement.

"Therefore, we the undersigned strongly disagree with the signing of the agreement by the federal government. We demand that our Ontario

government retract their signing of this agreement."

It is signed by 145 disconcerted residents of Ontario.

Mr. Hennessy: Mr. Speaker, I have a petition for the Minister of Natural Resources, signed by 2,600 people. The letter reads as follows:

"This letter is written in regard to the Indian fishing pact signed on December 17, 1982, between the Ontario Conservative government and certain status Indian bands. Due to concerns of conservation and the apparent lack of study regarding possible environmental problems and the economic impact of all user groups, I strongly disagree with this pact.

"I request you, as my parliamentary representative, to ensure that the interests of all user groups are heard and considered. Only after such input and study can we have an acceptable agreement which may result in better fisheries management."

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

CLOSING OF CENTENNIAL SECONDARY SCHOOL

Mr. Swart: Mr. Speaker, I have a petition signed by more than 7,000 people opposing the closing of the newest and best secondary school in the growth area of the city of Welland, the Centennial Secondary School. I would like to pass this petition over to the Minister of Education.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

VITAL STATISTICS AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Elgie moved, seconded by Hon. Mr. Drea, first reading of Bill 13, An Act to amend the Vital Statistics Act.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, this is reintroduction of the same bill that was in the House last session.

3:30 p.m.

LAND TRANSFER TAX AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Ashe moved, seconded by Hon. Mr. Ramsay, first reading of Bill 14, An Act to amend the Land Transfer Tax Act.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: Mr. Speaker, this bill will ensure that a nonresident may not avoid the 20 per cent tax imposed on conveyances of agricultural land. Under the current Land Transfer

Tax Act, it is possible for a nonresident to avoid payment of the proper rate of tax through the purchase of shares in a company that owns Ontario agricultural land or by acquiring the beneficial interest of a trust that owns agricultural land.

As well, a number of administrative amendments are included in the bill that will extend the notice of objection and appeals provisions, allow nonresident purchasers to pay the lower rate of tax on acquisitions of agricultural and recreational land in Ontario for certain specified purposes, recognize the single consolidated affidavit and provide for the determination of the value of consideration on certain conveyances.

CONSUMER PROTECTION AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Newman moved, seconded by Mr. Wrye, first reading of Bill 15, An Act to amend the Consumer Protection Act.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Speaker, this bill requires that every product offered for sale by a retailer that is marked with the universal product code must also be clearly marked with its individual purchase price. This would ensure the purchaser or the consumer the privilege of comparison shopping rather than simply shopping without knowing the price of the article.

ELECTION AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Boudria moved, seconded by Ms. Copps, first reading of Bill 16, An Act to amend the Election Act.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, this bill would provide for a procedure of voting by mail for the convenience of persons physically incapable of attending a polling place. This system would be an alternative to the present procedure of voting by proxy.

The bill was introduced in the last session and has since received the approval of the Ontario March of Dimes, the Multiple Sclerosis Society of Canada, the Muscular Dystrophy Association of Canada and several other groups.

MOTION TO SET ASIDE ORDINARY BUSINESS

Ms. Copps moved, seconded by Mr. Nixon, that pursuant to standing order 34(a), the ordinary business of the House be set aside in order to debate a matter of urgent public importance, namely, the recent decision on the part of the

Ontario cabinet not to include the doctors of Ontario in the province's wage restraint program, thus necessitating the expenditure of large sums of public moneys to meet the increases in the doctors' fee schedule, funds which could more properly be applied to job creation programs to help alleviate this province's continuing unemployment crisis, particularly among Ontario's youth.

Mr. Speaker: I wish to advise all honourable members that the notice of motion has, in fact, been received in time. I am prepared to listen for up to five minutes to why the honourable member feels the ordinary business of the House should be set aside.

Ms. Copps: Mr. Speaker, first of all, it is with regret that I rise, and I am sure with regret on the part of the Minister of Health (Mr. Grossman) that I have to rise today, to move such a motion. I can understand why the minister would resort to the kind of ghoulish spying tactics he used on the member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Kerrio), because when somebody is going down he must go down kicking and screaming.

If we look back at the comments that have been made by the Premier (Mr. Davis), the Minister of Health and the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) over the last six months, we certainly cannot understand why they would not have supported legislation which would have brought the doctors into the program.

I think we have all had our fun here in the House and, believe me, we have all enjoyed the spying tactics of the Minister of Health. But, at the same time, there is a fundamental principle involved here, which obviously the NDP are not involved with in the sense that they support the position of the doctors receiving the amount of money they are going to receive; therefore, since they are out of the play, they must of necessity come on the attack as well.

There is a fundamental principle involved here. I am sure any of you who joined with me in the 1981 provincial election will remember that there were hospital workers at that time who were forced to go out on an illegal strike in order to make a point for economic remuneration. Since that time, we, as a party, and the government of the province of Ontario have called upon the people of Ontario, the public servants of Ontario, to make extraordinary sacrifices above and beyond the call of duty in view of the dire economic straits that this government has led this province into.

We, as a party, supported that legislation. We supported it because we believe that these are

extraordinary times that require extraordinary measures. The government espoused those measures last December. I think all of the government members must sit and really feel rather embarrassed about what has happened in cabinet in the sense of how they can go back to their ridings. How can the Minister of Labour (Mr. Ramsay) speak to the labouring people of this province and ask those people, ask the private sector, ask the public sector, to make the kinds of sacrifices that have been required by legislation under Bill 179 at the same time that we do not have the courage of our conviction when it comes to the highest income group in Ontario? I would have to agree with my leader, who yesterday said that the sheer hypocrisy of the position taken by this government has been absolutely unbelievable.

For the record, I would like to read some of the comments made by our esteemed Premier in the month leading up to his hint that the doctors would be brought in under the restraint program. "I will deal with the medical profession. I know those people would love to legislate those doctors back as all public servants on a salary. That is the stated objective of the New Democratic Party. I would say to the honourable member I recognize the sensitivity of the issue. The medical profession is aware that we are calling on all people in public life and people in the public service to recognize the serious nature of the situation."

Again, there were comments made by the Minister of Health as late as September 30, 1982. Mr. Grossman said, "The province needs the doctors' co-operation to fight inflation because the more people that are involved in setting an example in all the private sector, the better the program will be. That is the whole point of the exercise." Mr. Grossman said the doctors had forced the government's hand. Well, that is clear enough. Mr. Grossman told reporters, "There is a chance the provincial government would bring the doctors under provincial restraint if no voluntary plan is offered."

That was tough talk that, unfortunately, collapsed when the chips were down. It seems to me that if we, as a government, as an opposition party and as a people, are to send a message of restraint out to our public sector and to make those demands and to ask those sacrifices of our public servants, the cleaning ladies and medical aids in the hospitals, as well as those who are involved in other public and parapublic sectors, we cannot do it on the backs of the lowest paid

of the public servants while we do not demand the same example from the highest paid.

Frankly, if we look back to Bill 179, if we look back to the section on price restraint, I think it will be found that our motion is in order and the government should move in this direction.

3:40 p.m.

Mr. McClellan: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of the emergency debate resolution before us this afternoon. I had a series of reasons why we needed an emergency debate, and we obviously have an additional reason today. Perhaps in the course of the debate over the whole afternoon, the Liberal Party will be able to arrive at a single, coherent position on the issue.

Mr. Foulds: Now that the member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Kerrio) is out of the House, they might.

Mr. Conway: So are Morty Shulman and Ed Ziemba. I mean let him with a stone, sin—cast the first stone, or whatever way it is.

Mr. McClellan: He without stone will cast the first sin.

I point with amazement at the absence of the leader of the Liberal Party, who only this morning said he had never been so angry in his entire life as he is and was over the question of the doctors. Of course, that was before the terrible ghoulish spying of the Minister of Health blew the whistle on the positions variously of the members of the Liberal Party. It is unfortunate that the performance of the Liberal Party here this afternoon has been so clownish that it has trivialized the issue, because it is an important issue.

The position the New Democratic Party has taken from the beginning of this fiasco—and it is a fiasco—is that the OHIP contract between the government and the Ontario Medical Association should be binding on both parties. It seems to me to be a fairly elementary proposition that a contract between two parties ought to be binding on both parties. We are saying it should be binding on the government—

Ms. Coppins: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: Just in terms of position—

Mr. Foulds: No, no, not during the five minutes.

Mr. Speaker: Order. No, no.

Ms. Coppins: Okay.

Mr. McClellan: A contract between two parties should be binding on both parties. The OHIP contract should be binding on the gov-

ernment, and the government has taken the position that it will honour the contract. Even though it is tearing up the contracts of its employees and its hospital workers, it is honouring the contract with the doctors on its part.

But there is no obligation on the part of the medical profession to honour its side of the contract. They are perfectly free to disregard the OHIP contract, the contract which sets the OHIP fee schedule. They are perfectly free to charge whatever the traffic will bear. It is as crude as that. We have evidence that in some hospitals in the city of Toronto obstetricians are charging up to 100 per cent above the OHIP fee schedule for a full-care childbirth. I raised examples here in the Legislature at the conclusion of the last session.

I want to stress that the terms of Bill 179 with respect to the administered price section and how that section would apply to the doctors was a fake from the start. My colleagues in the Liberal Party knew it was a fake from the start. The government could easily have written legislation that made it absolutely clear that the OHIP fee schedule was included in the definition of administered price. The government said from the beginning with complete callous and open hypocrisy that it intended to exclude the doctors.

Nevertheless, my colleagues in the Liberal Party supported Bill 179. They supported it from day one. They supported it when it became absolutely clear that the government had not the slightest intention of including the doctors and that the highest paid group in Ontario would be excluded. They still voted for Bill 179. I believe they voted for it at least five times, on five separate occasions. Now the leader of the Liberal Party and the health critic for the Liberal Party come into the Legislature shedding crocodile tears about the outrageous behaviour of the government. Where were my dear friends when they had the opportunity to oppose the government?

They cannot have it both ways. A contract is a contract. We would not rip up the contracts of the hospital workers and we would not rip up the contracts of the civil servants. We would not allow doctors who are being paid such extravagantly lavish salaries, which will return a net income of \$122,000 a year before the end of the contract, to break the contract by charging fees in excess of the OHIP fee schedule.

We would be pleased to debate this further this afternoon if you so rule, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Wrye: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker: I have sat by and listened to the end of the speech by my friend from Bellwoods, but I cannot let it go by, when he talks about hypocrisy, that his party launched the filibuster that prevented our amendment from coming to the floor for—

Mr. Speaker: Order. That is no privilege. The Minister of Health. He just dropped his speech.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: But I haven't lost my marbles like others.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: David Peterson. He sits in the middle over there. I remember.

Mr. Speaker, the issue to which you have to address yourself is whether this is a matter of urgent public importance and warrants an emergency debate, which you would have to decide has to be held this very afternoon. I would point out that in the notice of motion it is suggested that it is a recent decision on the part of the Ontario cabinet not to include the doctors in the province's wage restraint program. Of course, it would be inaccurate to suggest that it is a recent decision; it is a long-standing decision made last September.

Second, I would point out that there has been no change since that time, no change in the funding available to the health care system. In fact, there has been an increase, if anything, in the funding available to the health care system.

There is no imminent problem that has erupted since yesterday. The province's financial status has not changed one bit as a result of the confirmation yesterday that a decision made last September was not being changed. With regard to the imminent public importance of this matter with respect to provincial revenues, it will be about four or five weeks until the payments go out based on the new fee schedule; so there will be no change in the provincial balance sheet as of this afternoon.

Finally and most important, the real issue here is whether there is a need at all to discuss it today in view of the fact that the budget is coming down several weeks from today. The thrust of the motion is that the decision made last September somehow has created a situation that makes it difficult for the province to help alleviate the continuing unemployment crisis, particularly among Ontario's youth.

That, as the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) has already stated, will be the main thrust of his budget. It would be difficult if not impossible,

and certainly useless, to debate this matter today without having the benefit of the Treasurer's financial picture as he will lay it out on May 10, without having the benefit of his analysis of the revenues available to this province and without his analysis and decisions with regard to where he intends to spend the money we have available.

Without that information it is obviously quite premature to purport to have a discussion with regard to the allocation of funding to employment programs or any other programs at this time. The budget debate will ensue after May 10 and that gives sufficient time—indeed, some would argue more than sufficient time—to debate the very issues that have been talked about in the last few moments, whether the money could have been used elsewhere. I would argue, and I am surprised the Health critic moving this motion did not suggest it, that the funds should go to the health care system if there were some savings to be effected.

But all of those decisions really more properly can only be addressed and will only be a matter of urgent public importance importance from and after the date of the next budget.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I suggest you have little option but to rule there is nothing today that warrants withholding the ordinary business of the House to have an emergency debate. There is nothing new, no emergency, and plenty of time to discuss this with far more information, far more details and far more analysis available upon which these decisions can be made.

3:50 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: I have listened with great interest to the positions put forward by the three members representing each of the parties and I must say I have some strong feelings about this motion. However, in all honesty and fairness, having made the decision I did on the former motion based on the fact that we are engaged in the reply to the speech from the throne plus the fact, and I must refer to this, that standing order 34(c)(i) reads, "The matter proposed for discussion must relate to a genuine emergency, calling for immediate and urgent consideration". The problem I have with this, of course, is that nothing has changed from the original announcement that was made some months ago and therefore it is not immediate. I therefore rule that in my opinion the notice of motion should not be debated at this time.

Ms. Copps: I have no alternative, Mr. Speaker, but to challenge the ruling of the chair.

4:24 p.m.

The House divided on the Speaker's ruling, which was sustained on the following vote:

Ayes

Andrewes, Ashe, Barlow, Bernier, Birch, Brandt, Cousens, Cureatz, Dean, Eaton, Elgie, Eves, Fish, Gordon, Gregory, Grossman, Harris, Havrot, Hennessy, Hodgson, Johnson, J. M., Jones, Kennedy, Kerr, Kolyn, McCaffrey, McCague, McLean, McNeil, Miller, F. S., Mitchell;

Norton, Pollock, Pope, Ramsay, Robinson, Runciman, Scrivener, Shymko, Snow, Stephenson, B. M., Stevenson, K. R., Taylor, G. W., Timbrell, Treleaven, Villeneuve, Walker, Watson, Welch, Wells, Williams, Wiseman.

Nays

Allen, Boudria, Bradley, Breagh, Breithaupt, Bryden, Charlton, Conway, Copps, Cunningham, Di Santo, Eakins, Epp, Foulds, Grande, Haggerty, Johnston, R. F., Kerrio, Laughren, Lupusella;

Mackenzie, McClellan, McKessock, Newman, Nixon, O'Neil, Peterson, Philip, Rae, Reed, J. A., Reid, T. P., Renwick, Riddell, Ruprecht, Ruston, Samis, Swart, Sweeney, Wildman, Wrye.

Ayes 52; nays 40.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(continued)

Resuming the adjourned debate on the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

Ms. Copps: Mr. Speaker, like a dog chasing its own tail, the government's recent speech is nothing more than a rehash of old promises in a flickering of fading hope. While Ontario burns, the Premier (Mr. Davis) fiddles, fiddles with the future of thousands of unemployed Ontarians across this province by offering nothing more than a rehash of last year's wait-and-see provincial position—wait and see what the federal government is doing; wait and see what happens to interest rates; wait and see what happens in the private sector; wait and see whether the Premier will actually stick around provincial politics long enough to bring our economy to a complete standstill.

Yes, the Premier is engaged in an insidious and untimely charade of Trivial Pursuit. For

those of you who are unfamiliar with the game of Trivial Pursuit, the object is to achieve a pie. The key question, to achieve a pie in Ontario, is what Ontario politician who has never balanced a budget would actually have the nerve to present himself as a potential saviour of our country? That is right—William Grenville Davis. But then it should not surprise us that the expansiveness of his present audacity is equalled only by his government's past record of unfulfilled promises.

Let us refer for a moment, and I am sure my friends in the NDP who were decimated back on March 19, 1981, would want to refer for a moment to the comments made by the Premier when he dissolved the Legislature on February 2, 1981, in anticipation of the realities of March 19.

4:30 p.m.

His signal to close the session was, and I quote: "It is clear that a sitting of the present Legislature would be dominated by political rhetoric"—can you imagine political rhetoric?—"and manoeuvring as the various parties elbow each other on their way to the starting line. This is exactly what Ontario does not need at this particular time. What we do need"—and remember this is back in February 1981—"is a new parliament with a strong economic agenda for the next four years." That came, two years ago, from a government that has led us into a period of unprecedented high unemployment and economic stagnation.

Despite the grandiose promises of the "bilge" program, unemployment in Ontario has climbed to almost 600,000 people. Almost one in four young persons in this province does not have a job. The government's response? Consistent cutbacks over the last seven years in the amount of money set aside for summer youth employment. Funding for direct job creation in the last fiscal year totalled only \$231 million, although unemployment rose from 8.7 per cent to 12.6 per cent. This when the government does not even mention in its throne speech the difficulties facing steelworkers in my own community and across the province.

What hope does the Tory promise hold for young people struggling to find a place in the Ontario job market? Our former leader predicted this bleak situation back in 1981. The smug response of the government? He was called "Dr. No," "Dr. Negative." If Stuart Smith was Ontario's "Dr. No" the Premier was the "Goldfinger" that rubbed bare to reveal nothing but fool's gold on the government side of the

House. He says his slogans worked. In the short term maybe they did, but in the long term a philosopher once said, and the Premier should take note: "Propaganda is a soft weapon. Hold it in your hands long enough and it will move about like a snake and strike the other way."

Again quoting from the Premier's pre-election promises: "We seek a mandate to sustain and improve our major social programs, to continue to ensure that the education of our young, the care of our sick and the provisions for those in need are comparable to the best in the western world." Where have we heard that phrase before? Always "the best in the western world." This from a government that has the highest tax in Canada on those earning between \$15,000 and \$20,000, in terms of OHIP and personal provincial taxes, of any province in Canada.

"We seek a mandate to take practical and effective measures to control Ontario's environment. Nowhere in North America has more leadership been shown in efforts to control such major concerns as acid rain and liquid industrial waste." This from a government that has allowed the Niagara River to become the dioxin delta of the northern hemisphere, as well as continuing to stand by while Hamilton's Windermere basin is deemed one of the most polluted water bodies in North America.

"We seek a mandate to combat inflation through smaller and more efficient government, avoiding tax increases." This from a government whose first hysterical reaction to majority rule was to go out and purchase a \$10-million jet to carry the Premier to fewer than half the airports in Ontario. This from a government that moved in immediately to lower the taxes on brandy and cigars and dining at La Scala while introducing a nickel-and-dime squeeze on every toothpaste user, woman and low-income earner in the province.

This from a government that invested \$45 million in Minaki Lodge to protect its own loans. Not only does the government never expect to recover this investment, but the lodge will serve no one but the rich. This from a government that has spent nearly half a billion of taxpayers' dollars on land banking. Finally, this from a government that has invested \$650 million of taxpayers' money on Suncor and has lost more than \$50 million on its investment to date. This \$50 million could have been used to create more than 2,000 Ontario jobs.

What is the member for Leeds (Mr. Runciman) saying to his constituents today about the free

enterprise party that bought a quarter loaf of Suncor?

Again from the Premier's statement: "We seek a mandate to stimulate the growth and development of our important resource industry in all parts of the province, but particularly in northern Ontario." I know the member for Nipissing (Mr. Harris) will be interested in this. This from a government that has refused to present a single program to stimulate our mining and forest industries, even though unemployment rates in these areas are almost 30 per cent and 27 per cent respectively. This from a government that has never presented a single policy, even though promised as far back as 1977, that would lead to diversification of the economy of the north and deal with the problems of one-industry towns. People have been forced to leave the north because there simply are not enough job opportunities.

Again from the Premier: "We seek a mandate to improve and enhance the cultural life of this province on a number of fronts." This from a government that followed up with a threatened 15 per cent cutback in budgeting for cultural programs and then increased budgets in communities like my own—a paltry one per cent for the major botanical garden in the whole of Canada.

"A fair-minded and creative approach"—"creative" I will grant—"to Ontario's many cultural and linguistic communities can and must sustain the cultural opportunity of our province." This from a government whose respondent to the throne speech Tuesday did not even have the courage to refer to his leader's recent about-face on French language in Ontario. I guess it is all right to say it in French. C'est okay de le dire en français, mais Ernest Eves n'ose rien dire au sujet de l'école à Mattawa parcequ'il est un exemple typique de l'hypocrisie du gouvernement. The Carleton by-election lives on.

Again from the Premier: "We seek a mandate to take initiatives, not only to assist our farming community but to promote the use of Ontario farm products by our people in the greater interests of self-sufficiency." This from a government that twiddled its thumbs while 176 farmers in Ontario went bankrupt last year, the highest number in Canada. This from a government that appoints an asphalt farmer to oversee the survival of agribusiness in this most crucial time, when his main rural purpose seems to be garnering delegates for the greatest nonleadership race in Ontario's history, and has

yet to introduce any single program of its own to deal with the plight of our farmers. This from a government that promised financial assistance to young farmers but then used them as whipping boys for their deficit.

"And, above all, we seek a mandate to make constant and consistent efforts to continue and expand our industrial base, create more jobs, not only through encouraging new and expanded enterprises but also through efforts to enlarge markets for the products and services developed by the working men and women of our province." This from a government that has heralded unprecedented heights in unemployment, stagflation and the destruction of the economy. This from a government that contracts its own personal celebration of the Canadian Constitution, a coin, to an American firm, even when local Ontarians could have done the job. This from a government that would purchase peaches from South Africa, even though we sit in the heart of peach country right here in southern Ontario.

How significant is the future for a steelworker in my community, with unemployment more than 45,000 and prospects for rejuvenation of heavy industry dim? Where are the alternatives for a steelworker?

"In a province with the promise of Ontario, the people we serve will not be content only with a record of past accomplishments. They want a government that could look ahead, plan ahead and assure that our future will be as significant as our past." This from a government that has as its planning source for tomorrow the Innovation Development for Employment Advancement Corp., which in two years has yet to produce any ideas.

"There is every reason to look to the future with confidence and optimism." That confidence and optimism so trumpeted by the Premier was swept away by the realities of March 19.

To quote again from that infamous speech of February 1981: "The people of Ontario have that kind of government today. We must have the courage to do better in terms of our national industrial strength, our job creation, our international competitiveness, our national battle against inflation."

4:40 p.m.

Oh, where have all our promises gone? Two years later, and the only thing the government can offer in its throne speech is more empty rhetoric, more vapid verbiage, more broken

promises of the variety that were trumpeted in the realities of March 19.

What of substance has sprung from the recent throne speech? A recognition of women, they might say, with the panacea of one-chauffeur authority in a government that refuses to make a public commitment to equal pay for work of equal value; a government that vetoes a country-wide accord on the seven-year opt-out provision for women in their child-bearing years; a government that refuses to make a universal commitment to accessible day care and sees its own advisory council as a resting place for tired Premier's hacks.

We might say at least the government has finally recognized the need for developing new alternatives to traditional job patterns that are fast disappearing. But what is the government's reaction to the new technology? Quoting from the throne speech: "My government intends to undertake an intensive, extensive and serious study of these projected developments." The Premier studies while Ontario burns.

This throne speech is a disappointment to the farmer who is looking to Ontario for leadership, while the government is spending a smaller percentage of the provincial budget on agriculture than does any other province in Canada.

This throne speech is a disappointment to the steelworker who cannot find a job at the same time as the Ontario Manpower Commission has predicted a shortage of 45,000 skilled workers within three years.

This throne speech is a disappointment to tenants and landlords alike. Our rental housing stimulation program could increase vacancy rates and provide up to 26,000 jobs in the construction and related fields, but the throne speech thought the issue was important enough to accord it two paragraphs.

This throne speech is a disappointment to working people, those who have jobs and those who have lost them through industrial accidents. What happened to the major reforms promised in the changes to the Workers' Compensation Act? Has the fair deal of the last election campaign become the foul-weather friend of labour? Do not force workers to their knees, to begging on the front steps of the Legislature when this government has the means to bring about major and equitable social reform. Do not set up another bureaucracy. Do not set up another level of bureaucracy in the Workers' Compensation Board. Offer a fair deal to workers who have given up their right to litigate in

return for income security during compensable illness.

This throne speech is a major disappointment to all members of the social development committee and those across the province who have been victims of perpetrators of spousal assault. An all-party committee thought enough of the problem to issue a unanimous report recommending major funding changes to help transition houses survive, yet this government has chosen to ignore the whole issue in the throne speech.

The speech is a major disappointment for those who are very concerned about creeping privatization in Ontario's health care system and the state of health care in Ontario as a whole. I am sure the Minister of Health is well aware of my comments in the past on creeping privatization. Since he seems to have people at every meeting copying down words of people who say things in private, he will no doubt be aware that I have been very concerned and my party has been concerned for a number of months about the creeping privatization that we see affecting the system.

AMI (Canada) Ltd. is the thin edge of the wedge. Extendicare buying out a potential chronic care wing of an acute care hospital is the thin edge of the wedge. An increase in OHIP premiums is the thin edge of the wedge. A study undertaken by this government into user fees is the thin edge of the wedge.

The Treasurer suggests OHIP fees will be increased for the third time in four budgets and repeats publicly that he would like to see user fees introduced to help cover health care costs. I am sure the Minister of Health is aware of the position of his Treasurer on user fees, and yet this speech mentioned nothing about health care.

This speech is a major disappointment to those who look to the government for leadership. The so-called sound management lauded in the speech is typified in the bloated budget and borrowing of Ontario Hydro. With almost 50 per cent more generating capacity than it needs to serve Ontario, Hydro justified its overproduction by expensive advertising campaigns to convince consumers that bloated is better.

What leadership has this government shown with the restraint package and the noninclusion of doctors? What leadership has this government shown with respect to the tragic deaths at the Hospital for Sick Children? The Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry) has placed all of us on

a dizzy merry-go-round of innuendo, rumour and delay that makes a mockery of whatever justice may ever be brought to bear in this painful situation.

This speech was a painful vacuum for those families with children in the six treatment centres for the developmentally handicapped across Ontario. The government, in typical fashion if we refer back to the whole problem of mental health deinstitutionalization, has moved ahead to close first, plan later, even though living memories of the mistakes of the mental health system make front-page headlines with regularity in communities across this province.

Where other jurisdictions lead, we follow. But government by Gallup is catching up.

J. E. Chamberlain said: "I would like to live in a nation in which I would never be unconscious of the struggle of its stubborn nobodies, and in which the ideal excitements of mind and spirit would be implicated in the realities of its circumstances."

This government has long since abandoned the forgotten nobodies. This government has long since traded in excitement of mind and spirit for the banal certainty of tracking opinion polls. Let us dare to challenge our people—challenge them with a \$1-million construction program that will bring 15,000 units into the market; challenge them with skills training integrated into the final years of secondary school.

In this fast-changing world, skills obtained in the past can quickly become obsolescent or unmarketable. The government should move to provide extensive skills retraining and updating programs so as to ensure that individuals do not find themselves without a marketable skill and that our economy does not stagnate as a result of a mismatch between the skills we have and the skills we need. Such a program will necessarily involve government and business support and must be designed so that any individual may be self-supporting during the retraining period. Challenge them with opportunities so that small business people and farmers, the backbone of our economy, will not have that backbone crushed.

I happen to have a brother—he is here in the audience today—who is in the job market himself and who, like many young people, faces disappointments and disillusionment. Let us not disillusion the young people of this province. Let us not send them to other provinces, to other countries. Let us challenge them so that

we can provide a tremendous future in this province.

A joint government-business task force to examine the potential for the private sector to provide a wide range of products and services now provided by the government would be a start. As opposed to the government's present ad hoc, Band-Aid approaches to the agricultural industry, there must be a dedication and commitment to ensure a sense of security for the future. There is urgent need for the implementation of a strategy for agriculture within which farmers are able to make long-term farming decisions.

For the young and starting farmer, there must be a long-term financing program. The young farmer of Ontario has even more difficulty competing, since every other province in Canada has a better long-term agricultural program for young farmers. Challenge them with a health system where prevention, not treatment, is the primary objective. Challenge them with a social system that stimulates personal initiative without destroying the safety net so vital to a humane society.

Challenge them with job opportunities. The single most pressing issue by far, which the upcoming budget must deal with, is the unemployment crisis in Ontario and the need for job creation initiatives. The bulk of job creation in the province must come from the private sector, and the government must do everything it can to provide a favourable climate for this sector. But when shortfalls occur, as they have on a massive scale in the past few years, direct action by the government is required.

Cutbacks in spending on youth employment at this time are entirely unconscionable. This government is already spending 23 per cent less on aid for unemployed youth than it did two years ago, and it is cutting back programs while unemployment rises. The young people of Ontario do not deserve to be treated so callously. We must challenge our youth with programs that will give them jobs.

We must provide our young people with

hope, not despair. We must offer our farmers solutions, not bankruptcies. We must offer our workers jobs, not promises. We must offer a government of leadership, not hollow promises and unfulfilled dreams. For, in the words of Arthur Meighen: "Loyalty to the ballot box is not necessarily loyalty to the nation; it is not even loyalty to the multitude. Democracy has failed and fallen in many lands, and political captains in Canada must have courage to lead rather than servility to follow, if our institutions are going to survive."

The Deputy Speaker: Ms. Copps moves, seconded by Mr. Nixon, that the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session be amended by the addition of the following words:

"This House, however, regrets that the speech from the throne fails to address the most serious problems facing Ontario today, reflecting a total lack of government initiative, leadership and policy necessary to resolve these concerns, namely, the continuing unemployment crisis, particularly among this province's youth; the pressing need for a definitive industrial strategy, particularly the need for massive training and retraining programs; the urgent need for affordable housing in this province; the preservation of Ontario's health, social and educational sectors, and particularly support for hospitals, day care, services for the elderly and post-secondary institutions; the continuing problems facing farmers during these recessionary times. Therefore, this House declares its lack of confidence in the government."

On motion by Mr. Laughren, the debate was adjourned.

Hon. Mr. Gregory: Mr. Speaker, there will not be a statement of business this afternoon, but it will come tomorrow. Tomorrow we will be on interim supply.

The House adjourned at 4:54 p.m.

CONTENTS

Thursday, April 21, 1983

Statements by the ministry

Davis, Hon. W. G., Premier:	
Constitutional property rights	61
Miller, Hon. F. S., Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics:	
Budget	62
Snow, Hon. J. W., Minister of Transportation and Communications:	
Ontario Commission on Truck Safety	62
Stephenson, Hon. B. M., Minister of Education and Minister of Colleges and Universities:	
Services for print-handicapped students	63

Oral questions

Ashe, Hon. G. L., Minister of Revenue:	
Fuel tax regulations , Mr. Breaugh	75
Davis, Hon. W. G., Premier:	
Closure of facilities for the mentally retarded , Mr. Peterson, Mr. R. F. Johnston	65
Constitutional right to work , Mr. Rae, Mr. Epp.	70
Elgie, Hon. R. G., Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations:	
Conversion of rental units , Mr. Ruprecht	72
Grossman, Hon. L. S., Minister of Health:	
Physicians' fees , Mr. Rae, Mr. Peterson, Mr. McClellan	67
Miller, Hon. F. S., Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics:	
Physicians' fees , Mr. Peterson, Mr. McClellan	64
Job creation , Mr. Cooke, Mr. R. F. Johnston, Mr. Peterson	73
Pope, Hon. A. W., Minister of Natural Resources:	
Acid rain , Mr. J. A. Reed, Mr. Laughren	74
Ramsay, Hon. R. H., Minister of Labour:	
Minimum wage , Mr. Samis	74
Walker, Hon. G. W., Minister of Industry and Trade:	
White Farm Equipment , Mr. Nixon, Mr. Foulds, Mr. Laughren	74

Petitions

Indian fishing rights , Mr. Stokes, Mr. Hennessy, tabled	76
Closing of Centennial Secondary School , Mr. Swart	77

First readings

Vital Statistics Amendment Act , Bill 13, Mr. Elgie, agreed to	77
Land Transfer Tax Amendment Act , Bill 14, Mr. Ashe, agreed to	77
Consumer Protection Amendment Act , Bill 15, Mr. Newman, agreed to	77
Election Amendment Act , Bill 16, Mr. Boudria, agreed to	77

Private member's motion

Motion to set aside ordinary business, Ms. Copps, Mr. McClellan, Mr. Grossman, negatived. . . 77

Throne speech debate

Ms. Copps. 81

Other business

Visitor, Mr. Wells. 64

Deaths at Hospital for Sick Children, Ms. Copps, Mr. McClellan. 76

Capital grants for education, Mr. O'Neil, Mr. Boudria. 76

Adjournment. 85

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Ashe, Hon. G. L., Minister of Revenue (Durham West PC)
 Boudria, D. (Prescott-Russell L)
 Bradley, J. J. (St. Catharines L)
 Breaugh, M. J. (Oshawa NDP)
 Conway, S. G. (Renfrew North L)
 Cooke, D. S. (Windsor-Riverside NDP)
 Copps, S. M. (Hamilton Centre L)
 Cureatz, S. L., Deputy Speaker and Chairman (Durham East PC)
 Davis, Hon. W. G., Premier (Brampton PC)
 Elgie, Hon. R. G., Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (York East PC)
 Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP)
 Gregory, Hon. M. E. C., Minister without Portfolio (Mississauga East PC)
 Grossman, Hon. L. S., Minister of Health (St. Andrew-St. Patrick PC)
 Hennessy, M. (Fort William PC)
 Johnston, R. F. (Scarborough West NDP)
 Kerrio, V. G. (Niagara Falls L)
 Laughren, F. (Nickel Belt NDP)
 McClellan, R. A. (Bellwoods NDP)
 Miller, Hon. F. S., Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics (Muskoka PC)
 Newman, B. (Windsor-Walkerville L)
 Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
 O'Neil, H. P. (Quinte L)
 Peterson, D. R. (London Centre L)
 Pope, Hon. A. W., Minister of Natural Resources (Cochrane South PC)
 Rae, R. K. (York South NDP)
 Ramsay, Hon. R. H., Minister of Labour (Sault Ste. Marie PC)
 Reed, J. A. (Halton-Burlington L)
 Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L-Lab.)
 Ruprecht, T. (Parkdale L)
 Samis, G. R. (Cornwall NDP)
 Snow, Hon. J. W., Minister of Transportation and Communications (Oakville PC)
 Stephenson, Hon. B. M., Minister of Education and Minister of Colleges and Universities (York Mills PC)
 Stokes, J. E. (Lake Nipigon NDP)
 Swart, M. L. (Welland-Thorold NDP)
 Turner, Hon. J. M., Speaker (Peterborough PC)
 Walker, Hon. G. W., Minister of Industry and Trade (London South PC)
 Wells, Hon. T. L., Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Scarborough North PC)



Hansard

Official Report of Debates

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Third Session, 32nd Parliament

Friday, April 22, 1983

Speaker: Honourable John M. Turner

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

Contents of the proceedings reported in this issue of Hansard appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of the speakers taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is \$15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, Information Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 965-2238.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Friday, April 22, 1983

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers.

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY

PILOT PROJECT IN TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICES

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure for me to be able to share with the House initiatives designed to identify new ways of saving money. The Ministry of Government Services is undertaking a pilot project that should not only identify dollar-saving opportunities but will also provide information to enable us to improve service to the people of Ontario and our client ministries.

More than 85 per cent of all government business is conducted by telephone. That amounts to somewhere in the neighbourhood of 130 million telephone calls to and from government every year. We want to know how efficiently and effectively we are using our telecommunications system. We want to know how and where we can save money and we want to know how we can improve our service.

In order to collect this information, the Ministry of Government Services is testing a data-gathering system which will enable us to determine such things as the volume of calls on a telephone, how many times the phone rings before being answered, the number of calls coming in after normal working hours, as well as the chargeable calls to information.

Private sector corporations have shown savings of up to 25 per cent in telecommunications costs through this type of evaluation process, a very attractive figure in this time of constraint. During the trial period the datapulse system will be located solely at the Ministry of Government Services within the Queen's Park complex on a limited number of telephones.

The information we are gathering is purely statistical in nature. There is no capability in this procedure, nor would anyone want there to be, for monitoring conversations. We simply believe there is always a better way of doing things and we want to know how.

I would like to point out this is just one more example of the many initiatives being undertaken

by this government and my ministry to identify potential cost savings as well as to promote new ways of better serving the people of Ontario.

NIAGARA RIVER WATER QUALITY

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring the honourable members up to date on my ministry's continuing efforts to safeguard water quality in the Niagara River.

Late last summer, members may recall, I initiated an exhaustive study of the many factors that led to the gross contamination by waste chemicals of the Love Canal area in Niagara Falls, New York. Between 1942 and 1952 Hooker Chemicals and Plastics Corp. deposited an estimated 22,000 tons of chemical waste along the course of this abandoned waterway. Later, the city of Niagara Falls added municipal garbage. In addition, both during and after the Second World War, various United States federal agencies deposited unspecified toxic chemical wastes on this site.

Subsequently, of course, the President of the United States declared a state of emergency at Love Canal and the area was evacuated of some 2,000 residents. Since that time the United States state and federal agencies have conducted various studies and embarked upon certain initiatives to keep the contamination where it is and, above all, to keep it away from the shared resource, the Niagara River. At its closest point Love Canal is only a quarter mile from the Niagara River.

Quite frankly, neither I nor my officials have ever been completely satisfied with the progress the Americans are making. While the drinking water in communities on the Canadian side of the river is perfectly safe, as shown by our constant monitoring, we are conscious of the potential threat that exists if abandoned dump sites, such as Love Canal, are not properly controlled.

Members will recall that I have reported to them the discovery of trace amounts of dioxin and other chemicals as the result of our intensive, ongoing monitoring of water and testing of fish in the Niagara River and its tributaries. Most of these contaminants, we are convinced, are from American sources.

It was against this background of concern that last summer my ministry engaged a highly reputable engineering firm, Geologic Testing Consultants Ltd. of Ottawa, to carry out an independent technical review and interpretation of the hydrogeologic conditions of Love Canal. We wanted reliable, up-to-date data on which to base our future actions.

This report has now been completed and has been reviewed, resulting in a series of urgent recommendations which I am presenting to the government of the United States. The government of Ontario is asking the Secretary of State for External Affairs, the Honourable Allan MacEachen, to convey these recommendations to the government of the United States and to use the full weight of his office to make sure they are forwarded to the United States Environmental Protection Agency.

I would also hope and expect that the federal Minister of the Environment, the Honourable John Roberts, will add his own endorsement to the recommendations that are being put forward and with which, I might add, his staff are in full agreement.

In summary, this what we are asking the appropriate American authorities for: the provision of funds for the cleanup—not just further investigation, as things now stand—of sewers, creeks and outfalls that have been contaminated from the Love Canal area; the dredging of contaminated sediment from Cayuga Creek, which both we and the Americans know to be heavily contaminated and which drains into the Niagara River; a monitoring system to establish the long-term effectiveness of remedial work already planned by the Environmental Protection Agency; additional monitoring programs designed and put in place to show whether there is a possibility of ground water at the site moving downward into the bedrock below.

If all the actions contained in these recommendations are implemented, together with the remedial measures already in hand by the Environmental Protection Agency, I believe that the problems caused by Love Canal will in large measure be contained; and if the other waste disposal sites adjacent to the Niagara River are controlled to the same extent, we will have made a tremendous stride towards protecting and improving the river's quality.

10:10 a.m.

In conclusion, we must all realize that Canada and the United States are the joint custodians and protectors of the Niagara River. As the province which shares this waterway, Ontario

has the mandate and the responsibility to take action on behalf of its residents.

DEATHS AT HOSPITAL FOR SICK CHILDREN

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, I have a statement regarding the deaths of patients at the Hospital for Sick Children in 1980 and 1981. I have two basic matters to discuss and I would like to provide as much background information as possible on events leading up to the decisions through what has been an exceedingly challenging time for all involved.

First, no criminal charges will be laid at this time against any person who may be responsible for these deaths. Although this case is exceedingly complex, the reason for the Metropolitan Toronto Police and my senior criminal law advisers coming to this conclusion is simply that there is not sufficient evidence at this time to warrant the laying of any additional criminal charges.

I have personally reviewed the extensive police report, the report of the Ministry of Health and the Centers for Disease Control, the so-called Atlanta report, as well as other material, and I have met on numerous occasions with my officials and the police. I agree completely with the consensus reached by the police and my legal advisers as to the laying of additional criminal charges.

I hope honourable members will note that twice already I have used the phrase "at this time" in relation to the decision regarding charges. I want to assure members that if evidence ever becomes available to warrant the laying of additional charges, the public can be assured that charges will be laid and a vigorous prosecution pursued.

The second matter I want to discuss has to do with the process of accountability to the public in relation to the deaths and the circumstances surrounding them. Members will recall that the Ministry of Health announced a review of conditions and procedures in place at the hospital after the deaths. This extensive and comprehensive review was conducted by Mr. Justice Charles Dubin of the Supreme Court of Ontario and a team of medical experts. Their recommendations have either been acted upon or are under very active consideration by the hospital staff and administration. I should also add that there have been no unexplained deaths since March 1981.

I have already referred to a very extensive report of the Centers for Disease Control, which

dealt with both patient care issues at the hospital and the cause of death of a number of infants. I need not repeat what I said in the Legislature on February 21 about that report and its conclusions except to indicate that all issues relevant to patient care were brought immediately to the attention of hospital officials. Even though there have been these two intensive studies by two separate authorities, as well as a lengthy preliminary hearing of the criminal charges lasting some 44 days, it is my view that a further public forum is required to deal with the circumstances surrounding the many tragic deaths at the Hospital for Sick Children.

On my recommendation the cabinet has decided there is to be the establishment of a royal commission of inquiry to look into and report publicly on the circumstances surrounding the deaths at the hospital and the subsequent criminal proceedings. The commissioner is the Honourable Mr. Justice Samuel G. M. Grange, a member of the Court of Appeal for Ontario, formerly a member of the High Court of Justice for Ontario, a most experienced, distinguished and respected jurist. He will have available to him the resources necessary to conduct the inquiry, including the authority to engage counsel, investigators and any other staff who may be necessary for his purpose.

I would like to explain briefly some of the considerations we have had to face in the last few weeks in what has been one of the most difficult and complex situations I have encountered as Attorney General. I hope you will recall my statement of February 21, in which I said, "we as a government are committed to providing the fullest possible accounting of the events and circumstances that led to this tragedy." That commitment will be met.

The terms of reference for the commission, a copy of which is attached to my statement, expressly provide that the inquiry is not to involve any conclusion of law regarding civil or criminal responsibility. This provision was made to ensure that the commission would not function or be regarded as a criminal or civil trial. Trial by commission of inquiry is simply a concept that is totally foreign to the laws and the traditions of this province.

While it is understandable that many members of the public would wish to have an inquiry to determine responsibility for the tragic deaths, this cannot be the function of a royal commission. The purpose of a public inquiry is not to attach criminal culpability. It is not a forum to put individuals on trial. The just and proper

place to make and defend allegations of crime or civil liability is in a court of law.

In this context I am reminded of the remarks of an eminent Ontario jurist, Mr. Justice Riddell of the Ontario Court of Appeal, whose observations almost 50 years ago are equally applicable today: "A royal commission is not for the purpose of trying a case or a charge against anyone, any person or any institution, but for the purpose of informing the people concerning the facts of the matter to be inquired into. The object of a royal commission is to determine facts, not to try individuals or institutions, and this consideration is sufficient to guide the commissioner in the performance of his duty."

This principle is particularly important and relevant here because there have been criminal proceedings in relation to the deaths and civil proceedings are pending with respect to the initiation and prosecution of those charges. We are very sensitive to the need not to interfere with or undermine the rights of any litigant whose matter is now before the courts or who may come before the courts in the future.

I am advised that there is no precedent for an inquiry of this nature. To our knowledge there has never in Ontario been a commission of inquiry into deaths which are thought to have been the result of deliberate criminal acts by a person or persons unknown. Questions of that nature are ordinarily resolved in a court of criminal jurisdiction. Questions of unexplained deaths are ordinarily resolved in a coroner's inquest. Both of those mechanisms serve as the traditional methods by which the public obtains full knowledge of the circumstances of death.

Having determined that there will be no criminal trial in the immediate future and having considered the jurisdiction and procedural limitations of a coroner's inquest, we are of the view that a full public inquiry is the only method available to ensure a full public airing of all the facts referred to in the terms of reference.

The deaths, the legal proceedings which followed the deaths, and the subsequent inquiries and investigations, some of which have not been made public, have left unanswered questions of great public concern. It is in the interests of the parents of the children, the dedicated personnel at the Hospital for Sick Children and the administration of justice generally that the many issues raised, to the extent that it is humanly possible, be dealt with in a public forum.

It would presumably not be necessary for the commission to repeat all of the work done by

the Report of the Hospital for Sick Children Review Committee chaired by the Honourable Mr. Justice Charles Dubin, the Report on Mortality on the Cardiology Service in a Children's Hospital in Toronto, Canada, by the Centers for Disease Control and the Ontario Ministry of Health and the 44 days of proceedings at the preliminary hearing. The terms of reference refer to the undesirability of duplicating unnecessarily the work done by them or unnecessarily subjecting witnesses to further questioning.

Mr. Justice Grange is therefore empowered to draw from such reports and the preliminary hearing whatever evidence he deems relevant and appropriate and to dispense with the hearing of any testimony that he considers unnecessary. This would ensure that witnesses and institutions are not subjected to unnecessary repetition of previous questioning, but it does leave the commissioner the widest possible discretion to hear whatever evidence he considers relevant.

10:20 a.m.

The commissioner is given the full power under the Public Inquiries Act to require the attendance of witnesses and the production of documents and other relevant material. He has been given a specific mandate to hear whatever evidence he considers necessary to ensure full public knowledge of the completeness of the matters referred to in the terms of reference.

The specific matters to be inquired into are referred to as follows, and I am quoting directly from the order in council, which is attached in part:

"To inquire into and report on and make any recommendations with respect to how and by what means children who died in cardiac wards 4A and 4B at the Hospital for Sick Children between July 1, 1980, and March 31, 1981, came to their deaths;

"To inquire into, determine and report on the circumstances surrounding the investigation, institution and prosecution of charges arising out of the deaths of the above-mentioned four infants."

These terms of reference are designed to provide an opportunity for the fullest public knowledge of the circumstances of the deaths and the criminal proceedings that followed them. The qualification to which I referred earlier, that the inquiry is not to express any conclusion of law regarding civil or criminal responsibility, will, I repeat, serve to protect the interests of any past, present or future litigant in civil or criminal matters.

While it confers this protection, it does not restrict the commissioner from making the fullest findings of fact and any observations or recommendations he may have, short of determining any question that is or may ultimately be a matter for determination in a court of law.

I would like to say a brief word about the police investigation and about the parents of the children involved. As a parent of six, I have some understanding of the anguish and frustration these parents have felt over this tragic matter and have had to endure for over two years. At the conclusion of the police report of their investigation, the homicide squad officers asked that the parents be personally advised of any developments. They wrote:

"It is our firm belief that their feelings should be considered above everything else. No arrest, no particular line of investigation nor any particular type of public inquiry will ever bring their children back to life. For the most part the parents simply want to know, 'Was my baby murdered?'"

The police have again been in contact with the parents in recent days in an attempt to keep them informed of developments. The police investigators, together with my crown law officers, are now preparing a detailed written report for each family, setting out to the fullest extent possible in the circumstances the medical circumstances of each death.

Thousands of hours of diligent work have been put into this case by the homicide investigators. Expert help was provided by my ministry and other ministries whenever required. Medical specialists from throughout North America were made available as analysts and consultants. For several months we engaged experts from York University to analyze the enormous amount of information and statistics. We installed a terminal at the hospital and connected it to my ministry's computer to help digest the material and assemble it in useful formats for the investigators and scientists.

The police made use of the expertise available through the behavioural sciences section of the Federal Bureau of Investigation academy at Quantico, Virginia. A full-scale epidemiologic investigation was completed, using the resources and experts of several Ontario ministries as well as the Centers for Disease Control in Atlanta and outside consultants in paediatric cardiology, pathology and pharmacology. With the consent of the parents involved, nine exhumations were carried out at the height of the investigation. Our own Centre of Forensic Sci-

ences conducted the analysis of tissue samples preserved at the time of death and obtained after exhumation.

I mention this to give members and the public at least some indication of the scope of the investigation and the complexities that were encountered. It is worth noting that although they approached these deaths from different perspectives and backgrounds, the police investigators and the medical investigators came to essentially the same conclusions. As well, it is important to keep in mind that these deaths represent a tragedy of horrific proportions, simply unprecedented in Canada's history.

In conclusion, I would state that there is no guarantee that all of the unanswered questions will be resolved as a result of the inquiry. However, it does present the most appropriate mechanism for a high degree of public disclosure. I am sure its deliberations and findings will underline the importance of the accountability of society's great institutions to the people that they serve.

ORAL QUESTIONS

DEATHS AT HOSPITAL FOR SICK CHILDREN

Ms. Copps: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Attorney General.

In the terms of reference in the statement he tabled today he seems to make some limitations. If one looks to term of reference 4, he states that the public inquiry has been empowered with the responsibility of inquiring into determining and reporting "on the circumstances surrounding the investigation, institution and prosecution of charges arising out of the deaths of the above-mentioned four infants."

Can he clear up that the investigation will be empowered with the possibility of looking at institutions and all of the full details, not only surrounding how the babies died, which is referred to in order in council section 3, but also the treatment by the Attorney General's office and by the police after all of the 28 deaths were discovered?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, I hope there is no confusion over the two areas that will be inquired into.

First, all the deaths that occurred between the dates of July 1980 and March 1981 will be the subject matter of the investigation. The other fundamental aspect of the inquiry relates to the police investigation and the prosecution of

charges. That is where the four specific infants are involved because the criminal charges arise out of the deaths of four infants. The inquiry in so far as the cause of death of infants in that period is concerned will cover all children who died in the cardiac wards during that period.

Ms. Copps: Not having had the opportunity of seeing the full details of the Atlanta Centers for Disease Control report, which I understand the minister has been studying for a number of weeks now, it was my understanding that was the mandate of the Atlanta Centers for Disease Control and that they determined, as a result of information which the Attorney General issued in the House, that at least seven of the deaths were purposeful overdoses of digoxin.

The question I would like to determine is whether the public inquiry will be mandated not only with looking at the conduct of the crown attorney, the Attorney General's office and the police, as well as events following the laying of charges in the case of the four deaths, but also with looking at the treatment by the Attorney General's office and the police and the whole series of events following the discovery of 28 potential overdoses?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I would simply ask the member to read the terms of reference. I think they are self-explanatory.

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, can the Attorney General please explain to this House why the terms of reference do not include a specific section which addresses the question of the investigation by the hospital authorities themselves of those 28 deaths which occurred between 1980 and 1981? Why is that question not being specifically addressed? Surely that is central to the question of restoring public confidence in the hospital and answering the question that the parents have, which is, "Why was my child allowed to die?"

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, the terms of reference are very broad in that respect. They simply say, "to inquire into, report on and make any recommendations with respect to how and by what means children who died in cardiac wards 4A and 4B at the Hospital for Sick Children between July 1, 1980, and March 31, 1981, came to their deaths." I think that is a very broad term of reference and appropriate in the circumstances.

Ms. Copps: I think the second issue that certainly must be highlighted in the statement made by the minister today is that he continues

to insist that the possibility of charges being laid has not been eliminated. In fact he repeats, for all and sundry who may not have heard, that "at this time" are the operative words in his statement. I am sorry that over the last few months the minister has operated more by rumour and innuendo.

I wonder if the minister can confirm to this House that the police investigation has been completed and that there will be no charges laid. If the police investigation is not complete, what has changed since the time when we called for a public inquiry one year ago and the minister said he could not call for a public inquiry as long as the police investigation was going on?

10:30 a.m.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I will try to explain it once again. We said that as long as there was an active police investigation it would be inappropriate to have a public inquiry. I repeat what I said a few moments ago, which is that the fact of a public inquiry into deaths which are believed to have been deliberately caused is simply without precedent in this province. I would hope the member would appreciate the reason for that.

We are satisfied that the police investigation has been concluded as far as an active investigation is concerned. Obviously we expect, as has happened throughout, that additional information will come to the police that will have to be investigated. In this province charges have been laid, on occasion, many years after the deaths. Obviously one would hope that will not be the case here, but to suggest that the police investigation has been concluded absolutely and for all time when the simple fact is that the belief is there have been children who have died as a result of a deliberate overdose of digoxin is simply a ludicrous suggestion.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SUPPORT SERVICES

Mr. Conway: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Provincial Secretary for Social Development, or the superminister. The minister will be aware that in recent days the report of the Joint Task Force on Neighbourhood Support Services has been released here in Metropolitan Toronto. As she knows, that task force report paints a dark and sorry picture about the state of community-based social service agencies in much of Metropolitan Toronto.

I am wondering, and I know other members are as well, as are the many client groups and the

people they serve—the elderly, the singles, low-income families and others—what precisely will be the reaction of the government of Ontario vis-à-vis the report I have referred to.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Mr. Speaker, through you to the honourable member, I have not had an opportunity to read that report. I have not seen the report. All I have seen is the comments in the newspapers. It has been brought to my attention by the front page of the Toronto Star today that the Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Drea) has already indicated there is more money available for many of the agencies referred to in that report.

Mr. Conway: Will the superminister for social development give this House an undertaking that she will read this report as soon as possible, notwithstanding the commitments made by her junior colleague, one of the line ministers, the member for Scarborough Centre (Mr. Drea)?

Will the superminister not want to agree that the government's social policy turns on healthy community-based services, particularly in the social development area, and that this report indicates clearly that those social service agencies with a community base here in Metropolitan Toronto face an immediate critical situation? Will she not agree that is a situation of immediate concern that ought to be redressed at the earliest opportunity?

Will she also give an undertaking to look seriously at the proposal for a neighbourhood support fund, estimated to be worth in the first instance roughly \$21 million with a large share of provincial lottery funding? Will the superminister give an undertaking to the people of Metropolitan Toronto, the disfranchised, the alienated, the lonely, who are everywhere reported in this report, that she will give that recommendation very serious attention and report back to this House at her earliest convenience?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: This government has always been concerned where there are any disadvantaged people who are not receiving the amount of support they should be. Unfortunately, those who wrote the report and prepared it have not seen fit to send it to my office. I will attempt to have one delivered to my office and then I will read it.

To the rather snide remarks of the opposition member, I would also like to respond that I do not consider myself a superminister and there are no junior ministries within our social policy field.

Mr. R. F. Johnston: I think there is a general agreement around the House, Mr. Speaker, that nobody thinks she is a superminister.

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

Interjections.

Mr. R. F. Johnston: It was only meant in a funny way, not in a serious way, and was hardly snide at all.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Question, please.

Mr. R. F. Johnston: I am sure the minister has a sense of humour, as I know.

Mr. Speaker, what specific plans does the minister have to make sure there is a comprehensive and not a gap-filled network of neighbourhood services in places such as Metropolitan Toronto and other places in the province? While she is answering the question, would she perhaps hand us a copy of the little briefing notes that the junior minister gave her a few minutes ago?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Mr. Speaker, I have no comments to make to that very snide and uncalled-for question.

DEATHS AT HOSPITAL FOR SICK CHILDREN

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the inquiry that he has established today, I would like to ask the Attorney General if he will please explain again to me and to the Legislature why the inquiry in a sense is being restricted.

I simply ask the Attorney General to look at sections 3 and 4 of the terms of reference. As I read section 3, it is essentially a medical inquiry into the cause of the deaths of either the 36 or the 28, depending on what the numbers are, that took place between July 1980 and March 1981. Section 4 is limited to an investigation of the charges arising out of the deaths of the four children who were the subject of the criminal prosecution against Susan Nelles.

Does the Attorney General not think a third question is being left unanswered, and that is, what were the management practices, the investigative practices, the general administrative practices of the hospital between 1980 and 1981 that allowed that number of deaths, for a time at least, to go undetected and unreported? Does he not think this question, which deals in a sense with the accountability of the hospital administration and procedures itself, has to be addressed by the public inquiry if we are going to restore full public confidence in the hospital?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: First of all, Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member will look at Mr.

Justice Dubin's report again, as I recall, he devotes a whole section to that issue.

Second, I should point out that the matters of the internal procedures in the hospital during that period may very well be relevant to the cause of deaths if there were inadequacies, as has been suggested or implied in the question, and those obviously can be looked into, in my view, within these terms of reference. If there are any internal procedures in the hospital that could have contributed to the cause of these deaths—and this is what we are interested in—then they certainly can be inquired into under the terms of reference that have been given to Mr. Justice Grange.

Mr. Rae: The Attorney General knows full well that Mr. Justice Dubin's inquiry was limited and that it was specifically related to the future. He says time and time again, "I am looking to the future; I am not looking to the past." It was not primarily an inquiry into what had taken place in ward 4; it was primarily an inquiry into what kinds of changes could be made for the future. It was not the kind of inquiry that is needed to restore full public confidence with respect to the events that occurred.

10:40 a.m.

I simply ask the Attorney General, given the fact that he stated in the House today he is willing for the inquiry to look into this question, why he does not make that a specific item in the terms of reference. He knows very well that once the public inquiry has been established he is no longer in charge of it and Mr. Justice Grange is limited by the words I am sure he is going to be reading very strictly, as will counsel for the hospital and counsel for everybody else included in this affair.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I repeat essentially what I said a few moments ago. Mr. Justice Dubin did have to examine the procedures that were in place during this period. That forms part of his report, if the leader of the New Democratic Party would care to look at that report. I repeat what I said a moment ago, to the extent that the procedures in place at the hospital could have contributed, or the inadequacy of any procedures could have contributed, to the deaths of any of these infants, they will be inquired into. To me that is quite clear on the face of the terms of reference.

Ms. Copps: Mr. Speaker, frankly I am shocked that the Attorney General has such a fundamental misunderstanding of the purpose of the Dubin inquiry. I think if he goes back and

reviews the statement made by his colleague the Minister of Health (Mr. Grossman) in calling the Dubin inquiry, the minister specifically stated that the inquiry was to look at present procedures as they existed in the hospital and was restricted from looking at the events surrounding and leading up to the deaths of the four babies on wards 4A and 4B at that time.

Will the minister not agree that the terms of reference as stated here in the House today are limited, that the refusal, or perhaps the decision not to include the other 24 deaths in the expanded terms of reference included in point 4 could seriously undermine the possibility of getting to the facts, the post-mortem treatment of this issue by the hospital, by the Attorney General's office, by the crown attorney and by the police investigation, and in particular the treatment of the parents involved in all the 28 deaths?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member has read the terms of reference I would say she has clearly misunderstood them. I would simply ask her to reread the terms of reference and she will see that all the relevant matters relating to the deaths of all the children during this period will be part of the inquiry.

Mr. Rae: I think one of the problems in the way the government has handled this whole affair, from the time the Minister of Health established the Dubin inquiry and in regard to the extraordinary delay in the decision to launch this royal commission, is that the critical question in the minds of not only a great many citizens of this province but I suggest in the minds of the parents of those children who so tragically died in those months, may well go unanswered.

That critical question surely is not simply the spectacular, headline-grabbing question of murder or nonmurder, but a much more difficult question: How is it in a hospital that is a world-class institution, an institution whose reputation we all want to protect and defend, 36 deaths could have been allowed to occur in the months in question and many of those deaths were unreported, certain conclusions not being drawn quickly enough to get to the root of this thing? Why were they allowed to remain undetected and unreported over such an extended period of time?

I think the Attorney General has an obligation to the people of this province and to the parents of those children to deal specifically with that question and to stop fluffing around

and leaking things and shuffling it off on other inquiries that never had to address that question. He should simply add another term of reference that will deal specifically with the question of how it is that this number of deaths could have gone undetected and unreported for such a long period of time in the Hospital for Sick Children.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: If the leader of the third party harboured the slightest sense of responsibility about anything, he would not be deliberately attempting to confuse unnecessarily a very tragic, complex issue. I think he should be embarrassed by the nonsense he is spouting. It is quite clear the terms of reference are adequate for the commissioner to inquire into anything that is relevant. The member knows that, and the fact that at this time he wants to turn this into a petty issue of political partisanship hardly does him very much credit.

Mr. Rae: It is called accountability, something the Attorney General does not know very much about.

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

SECURITY OF TENURE IN RENTAL UNITS

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, by way of a second question, I would like to ask the Attorney General whether or not he is aware of an increasing practice in Metropolitan Toronto whereby the Landlord and Tenant Act is being undermined by buildings being sold to limited companies, to tenants in common in those limited companies, which is resulting in many tenants fearing that they will be evicted as a result of this loophole, in a sense, in the Landlord and Tenant Act.

I know the Attorney General is familiar with a recent decision of the Divisional Court in the Medeiros case, which has given rise to concern among a great many tenants. The Attorney General should be aware that there are tenants at 41 Lake Shore Drive, 22 Allanhurst Drive, 30 Allanhurst Drive, 785 Brown's Line, 3621 Lake Shore Boulevard West and 3625 Lake Shore Boulevard West, where there are literally hundreds of apartments which are now being threatened by this practice, which is increasingly common.

I would like to ask the Attorney General, is he aware of this development and is he prepared to introduce amendments to the Landlord and Tenant Act right away in order to provide some

security of tenure for the tenants who are currently in these buildings?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we are aware of this, and I think it is fair to describe it as a problem. This is a matter that has been under active review by our ministry, the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing and the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations. Some specific proposals are being discussed at this time and I would hope that within the next 10 days we will be able to make a joint statement to the House as to what might be appropriate legislation.

Mr. Rae: I would simply indicate to the Attorney General that this is not an academic issue. In the gallery today, Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and to the Attorney General Mrs. Bozene Zapletal, who is a 74-year-old widow living at 30 Allanhurst Drive and who has received an eviction notice from someone who is a part of one of these tenancies in common. That eviction notice takes effect on June 30, 1983.

I want to ask the Attorney General whether he will bring in legislation as soon as possible to protect people like Mrs. Zapletal who are going to be facing eviction unless something is done very soon.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I repeat, we are aware of the situation and the matter is under very active review. I cannot commit the government to introduce any specific legislation until it has, of course, been approved by the executive council of this province. I indicated that I expected we would be in a position to advise the House as to what we intended to do and obviously it would be desirable if we could do that as soon as possible, but I cannot commit the government in advance of a decision by the cabinet of this province.

Mr. Philip: Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General will recall that on Wednesday, at a meeting with representatives of the Federation of Metro Tenants' Associations, he was advised by a lawyer acting on behalf of tenants that a number of cases of evictions would come up by the end of May. He will also recall that he was asked to examine a private member's bill which I introduced on Tuesday as a possible solution to the problem.

Has he examined that bill and is he prepared at least to assure the House that legislation will be put before us by the end of May before those court cases are heard?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, I cannot say anything other than what I have already said. This is not a decision to be made by an individual member; it has to be made by the government of this province. I expect a decision will be made in the very near future and the House will be advised accordingly.

TILE DRAINAGE

Mr. Ruston: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture and Food with regard to tile drainage. In view of the ongoing need for tile drainage of agricultural land, which can increase production yields of up to 50 per cent and return \$18 for every dollar invested, will the minister assure us that the interest rate under the program will be reduced to the former eight per cent level in recognition of the present low cost of borrowing to the government, and will he adjust the program so it covers 75 per cent of the drainage projects rather than the present 60 per cent?

10:50 a.m.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, I expect to be announcing details of the 1983 tile drainage program within the next week.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, in view of the government commitment through the Board of Industrial Leadership and Development program, which stated that one million acres of land would be drained in eastern and northern Ontario, the high interest rates the government has placed on that program now render it totally ineffective. In the case of one municipality in my riding, the township of Russell, where last year when we had lower interest rates there were 23 applications, only two people are waiting this year. Does this not make the program totally ineffective?

Is it not a fact that while the government is continuing with these high interest rates it will never achieve anything close to its objective of draining one million acres in eastern and northern Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, I am not entirely sure what point the honourable member is trying to make, but let me remind him that last year the program was restructured. The member may recall that while the legislation says support may be granted for up to 75 per cent of the work, in earlier years the level of support ranged very widely from as low as around 30 per cent in some townships to as high as 75 per cent in a very few townships. I

recommended to all municipalities last year that they grant support at 60 per cent, which is roughly the average level of support of earlier years.

In addition, we indicated from the outset that the priority areas were eastern and northern Ontario. Every township in eastern Ontario in 1982 got, to the penny, what it asked for to spend on tile drainage, including in Prescott and Russell, to the—

Mr. Boudria: That is not the point. Nobody is using it.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: It is the point.

Mr. Boudria: No, the program is ineffective. Nobody is using it. Your interest rates are too high.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I think you have answered the question. Thank you.

NORCEN ENERGY RESOURCES LTD.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Attorney General and it relates to the decision of his colleague the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Elgie) and the Ontario Securities Commission not to proceed with charges under the Securities Act against Norcen Energy Resources Ltd., Conrad Black and Edward Battle.

I refer to his colleague's comment on April 19 that "the Attorney General, in conversations and correspondence with me a week ago today"—that is, April 12, the day of the expiration of the limitation period—"indicated that some of his crown law officers had a differing point of view and asked if, in the light of that, I would ask the commission to review its decision." It goes on to say that this he did, and that his representative attended the meeting of the commission on April 12.

What exactly did the minister ask of his colleague with respect to that investigation carried on by the Ontario Securities Commission?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, my recollection is that we received a copy of the report of the Ontario Securities Commission investigators on April 9. It was reviewed and our law officers—having been injected into the process at an early stage, which was unusual, but given the ongoing criminal investigation; that is the way events unfolded—were of the view that the recommendations in that report were sound. When we learned they were not going to be accepted by the OSC, I was of the view that the

interests of the administration of justice required that I at least request the minister responsible for the legislation to ask the commission to review its decision.

As the member for Riverdale knows very well, and he has some real degree of expertise in these matters, this legislation is largely regulatory legislation and any prosecutions under it require the consent of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations.

In my view, the Legislature, in structuring the legislation, obviously was of the view that a certain amount of prosecutorial discretion should reside within the responsibility of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations. As I understand the legislation, in exercising that prosecutorial discretion as to whether to give a consent, the primary advisory body for him is the Ontario Securities Commission because it possesses a degree of expertise in relation to the regulation of the securities market as to what is in the interests of the market and the public interest that does not necessarily reside within the ranks of the crown law officers.

It was simply our view that, given the evidentiary base as we understood it, this matter merited reconsideration by the OSC and I advised the minister accordingly. I really do not think I can say anything more at this time because the criminal investigation into these matters has not been concluded.

Mr. Renwick: Since his colleague the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations did not direct the commission to proceed, since the limitation period expired at midnight on April 12 with respect to the offences under section 118 of the Securities Act, and since his colleague indicated quite clearly he had not had any request from the Attorney General with respect to giving his consent if he were asked and, if he were not asked, asking him to direct the commission to lay the charges, is the Attorney General now precluded, as a result of that decision, from considering the laying of any charges under section 118 of the Ontario Securities Act, and is he now limited in his ongoing police investigation to the question of whether charges should be laid under the Criminal Code?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege: With respect, and it may be that there are some who have other views, it is my view that the member for Riverdale is in error in part of his remarks.

First, if he will consult others and review the

statute he will find that the minister in that statute has the power, under earlier sections, to direct an independent investigation into some issues, and as a result of those investigations, to direct the securities commission to do certain things. However, if the commission investigates matters on its own initiative, then the role of the minister is to consent to be requested, with respect to a consent to prosecutions if the commission so requests. I would like to point out that distinction to the member. That is my understanding and, therefore, If I am correct, he is in error in what he said.

Mr. Renwick: We will have ample opportunity to deal with it on another occasion. I want to know from the Attorney General, so that the question is clearly understood, does the action of his colleague and the failure of the Attorney General to ask his colleague to direct the commission to lay those charges mean that for all purposes of the ongoing police investigation, about which the Attorney General advised me it may be by the end of May that the decision will be made, it is now limited entirely to questions of whether charges will be laid under the Criminal Code?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: The limitation period has expired but I want to make it very clear, and I think the member fully appreciates this, that it would have been quite improper for the Attorney General to direct the minister to direct the Ontario Securities Commission how to exercise its prosecutorial discretion.

Interjection.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Obviously the credit I gave the member for some modest understanding of this legislation was probably misplaced.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, now that the Attorney General has entered his condescending phase on this subject, as he does eventually on all others, I will give him a chance to fulfil that feeling. Would he not think it would fulfil his responsibilities better to this House, as well as those of his colleague the minister who interjected a moment ago, if the two of them undertook to make a full and complete statement on this matter to the House, even stooping so low as to take the two stories from Maclean's and to answer the situation point by point?

11 a.m.

Would he not agree the indictment from Maclean's is an extremely important one that should not be dealt with in this House simply by the condescending answers to which we have been treated in regard to specific questions in

question period which cannot possibly cover the field of this important and far-reaching situation? Without doing that, does the minister not realize we can only assume there is something to the charge of protection of people in high places or else serious incompetence?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, as has already been pointed out, there is an ongoing criminal investigation. When that matter is concluded, we will be advising the House accordingly in relation to that and in relation to any other matters which may be relevant at that time.

EDUCATION FOR MENTALLY HANDICAPPED

Mr. Bradley: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Education. Is the minister aware of the concern of parents of severely and profoundly retarded children that the implementation of Bill 82, instead of having a positive effect, will have an adverse effect on the education and care of these children?

At present they are under the auspices of the Ministry of Community and Social Services, fully funded and educated in developmental centres. If the minister is aware of this concern, is she prepared to entertain the idea of amending Bill 82 to permit boards of education to purchase services from associations for the mentally retarded and, therefore, maintain the developmental centres and/or modify the Education Act to provide for the category of severely and profoundly retarded, which would allow the school boards to deal on a different basis with these children and those who are categorized as trainable mentally retarded?

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, I doubt amendments to the act would be necessary since I think the honourable member understands that school boards are currently permitted under the act to purchase educational programs from other boards. The care and treatment of children does not fall within the ambit of responsibility of boards of education or school boards.

What we have been attempting to do is to find ways in which arrangements can be made to provide educational programs to pupils or children who are in care in institutions or in other kinds of arrangements. That certainly is a part of our intent in terms of the implementation of Bill 82.

In addition, I could tell the member that the definitions which are necessary in a broad way to implement fully, for example, the identifica-

tion and placement review committees, are being examined and defined right now by the Advisory Council on Special Education. That activity has not been completed. They have most certainly looked at the area of the developmentally handicapped in a way which I think is somewhat similar to the direction the member was suggesting.

Mr. Bradley: These parents and others have expressed concern about the availability of elevators and ramps, supervised busing, student-teacher ratio, administration of medication, assistance with toileting and length of the school year for the profoundly and severely retarded individuals.

My colleague the member for Kitchener-Wilmot (Mr. Sweeney) during the debate on Bill 82 under subsection 7(9) suggested and had accepted an amendment which said, "Where the board determines that the pupil is a hard-to-serve pupil and the parent or guardian of the pupil agrees with the said determination, the board shall assist the parent or guardian to locate a placement suited to the needs of the pupil and reimburse the parent or guardian for any expenses incurred by the parent or guardian in locating such placement."

In view of the fact that that exists already in the act, and I know it is in the general part of the act as opposed to the other, would that circumstance permit what the people who are the teachers and the parents of the profoundly and severely retarded want? Can they achieve it through that section of Bill 82?

Hon. Miss Stephenson: If the member will read that section carefully, he will understand, as I said earlier, that under no section of the Education Act, nor within the philosophy of the educational activity within this province, are boards of education responsible for the care and treatment of children they are educating. That is a responsibility that lies outside their area of jurisdiction.

What we had proposed, which was modified slightly by the member for Kitchener-Wilmot, was that boards would assist parents in attempting to find appropriate placement for children who had educational difficulties as well as difficulties in other areas. What I hear the member suggesting is that those children who are currently being cared for within centres for the developmentally handicapped should have their educational program or their care in that program subsidized by the boards of education, and that is not a part of their responsibility.

As I said earlier, what we are making, and we

have achieved it in a number of areas, is an arrangement that allows a board of education to provide an educational program for children who are currently being cared for in a different kind of circumstance. That is there already, and if there is an impediment in terms of dealing with the profoundly and severely retarded, the group the member defines, then I will most certainly look at that to try to remove any impediment.

EDUCATION FOR MULTIPLY HANDICAPPED

Mr. Grande: Mr. Speaker, my question likewise is to the Minister of Education. The minister is aware that regulation 617/81 of the Education Act states that in no case should the enrolment in a multiply handicapped class be more than six students. I am talking about students who have profound deafness, profound sight impairment, are mentally retarded, quadriplegic, etc. Why does the Scarborough Board of Education have a policy that is in direct contravention to that regulation of the Education Act in the sense that it is placing nine children in a multiply handicapped class? Is there an explanation for that?

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure it would be accurate to suggest that board has a policy about this, but the matter, which was raised by the member several months ago, has been addressed by the central regional office of the Ministry of Education. I would remind the member that this regulation is currently under review as a result of the activities involved in implementation of the amendments to the Education Act contained in Bill 82. Most certainly if a board is in violation of the regulation, that will be addressed vigorously. At this point I am not aware that there is an intentional violation, but that certainly is being investigated.

Mr. Grande: Surely the minister or the ministry's special education department ought to be aware that in the needs assessment progress report and plan for 1981 and for 1982—and the ministry has had these reports for two years—the Scarborough Board of Education, while it makes mention of regulation 617/81 and the fact that enrolment should not be more than six pupils, states very clearly and very bluntly, "Your officials believe that Scarborough's policy of placing up to nine pupils in each multiply handicapped program with a special education teacher and a teacher's aid has been a viable one." Is this or is this not a direct policy of

Scarborough and, therefore, a total contravention of the regulations of the province?

Hon. Miss Stephenson: I believe the document the member is referring to is one of the planning documents developed by the Scarborough board as a result of its activity in the pilot year for the implementation of Bill 82, all of which he knows is continuing under discussion. The inclusion of that clause in the report suggested to the trustees of the Scarborough board that the arrangements they had suggested as being reasonable in that area were reasonable arrangements. They were also trying to draw to the attention of the ministry that perhaps we should be re-examining whatever it is we have in place in terms of that pupil-teacher ratio.

I think it is the responsibility of boards to do that but if, as I said, there is a real contravention of a regulation currently in place without valid supporting arguments, then obviously it will have to be addressed vigorously. It is in the hands of the central regional office now.

11:10 a.m.

NIAGARA RIVER POLLUTION

Mr. Kerrio: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of the Environment. The minister must be aware of a study conducted by a PhD student from Michigan State University that has found more dioxin in fish in the Great Lakes and rivers, and that the highest amount of dioxin was found in carp and suckers taken from the mouth of the St. Clair River, upstream from Windsor and Fighting Island—586 parts per trillion, more than 10 times the amount that the Ministry of the Environment showed in some of the fish it has tested. The dioxin content of the fish averaged 200 parts per trillion, 10 times higher than the amount the ministry considers safe in fish.

Every study taken by independent and government researchers builds up the threat of dioxin in the supply. Is the minister not aware that we must do something before we find traces too high to do anything about? Because of the fact that the federal government has given some \$4 million to improve the facility at the Niagara Falls plant, is the minister going to make sure they put in the most modern active carbon filters and any advanced filters that are going to do a proper job in the event that these dioxin figures continue to increase?

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the answer is yes, but I am just trying to figure out how many questions there were.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. That was a very complete answer.

Hon. Mr. Norton: I would caution the honourable member about jumping to any conclusions on the basis of the PhD student's results.

Mr. Kerrio: You got the same ones.

Hon. Mr. Norton: I am not trying to undermine them or say that they have not caused some concern within the scientific community and my ministry, but so far they are uncorroborated. They are so out of line with all the other testing that has been done that they are subject to question by the scientific community. So I think it would be folly on the member's part to jump to any conclusions until those results have been replicated.

Mr. Kerrio: On the contrary, Mr. Speaker, the student's study—his name is Mr. Kaczmar—has been validated by a distinguished panel of four experts for his doctoral dissertation, including the director of the Michigan State Pesticide Research Center, the director of Michigan's Institute of Water Resources and the pesticide expert from the Michigan department of wildlife. So the minister can see that this young gentleman's studies have been validated.

I want to remind the minister that it was a student from the University of Western Ontario who first discovered mercury in Lake St. Clair.

Mr. Speaker: Now for the question.

Mr. Kerrio: I make the point that dioxin continues to be a greater and greater threat. Because the minister made comments in his statement this morning that do not deal with one of the major concerns of the Niagara area, that is, the sewage treatment plant in Niagara Falls, New York, which is accepting toxic chemical waste from industries and not treating it at all—he has not mentioned it in his whole subject matter—it would appear that he has a long way to go.

I wonder when the minister is going to address himself to putting filters in before the toxic material becomes a danger to the people who are drinking the water.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, these questions range across the whole province. I wish I had time—and I know I have not—to give an equally full-ranging and complete response.

Mr. Speaker: He was speaking specifically of filters.

Hon. Mr. Norton: The honourable member keeps dredging up issues to which he already knows the answer. For example, in the case of

the Niagara Falls waste water treatment plant, he knows very well that this ministry intervened in the United States on that issue and it resulted in a withdrawal by New York state. There was a complete review of the thing, a revision downward to make more stringent standards apply to that waste water treatment plant.

The member also knows that as a result of efforts by this government—and we were given credit for it by the immediate past commissioner of the Department of Environmental Conservation in New York state—the Environmental Protection Agency released several million dollars to New York so that plant could be put back in operation.

The member should not stand there and imply in this House that we have not been doing our duty. It is the vigilance of this government, and not the government of Canada I might add, that has resulted in the substantial progress that has been made on a number of these critical issues in the Niagara River area.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Kerrio: I am glad those people on the other side are joining us because we are going to need all the help we can get to fight that—

Mr. Swart: You always need all the help you can get.

Hon. Mr. Norton: You need all the help you can get just to keep up with us. That is your problem.

Interjections.

Mr. Kerrio: Oh, no. This is one fight we have to win together.

Mr. Speaker: Now having established your positions, I will recognize the member for Hamilton Mountain.

Mr. Charlton: Mr. Speaker, the ministers of the crown all seem slightly touchy this morning.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Charlton: The issue which the member for Niagara Falls raises is a very serious concern. We have raised with the minister a number of times the issue of the increasing dioxin levels found in the fish testing which his own ministry has done. Can the minister tell us when we can expect to see the next round of results from Lake Ontario fish testing for dioxin content?

Hon. Mr. Norton: The answer to that is, as soon as they are available. I have never delayed the release of that information to the public. As

soon as the results of the ongoing testing are available they are released to the public.

Again, the perception of a dramatic increase in dioxin that the member is trying to propagate is not substantiated by the facts. What is happening is that our degree of sophistication as leaders in this field internationally has enabled us to detect the presence of dioxin at much lower levels; for example, in water it is measured in parts per quadrillion.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you.

Hon. Mr. Norton: If one looks at historical results one will see that—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Interjections.

OHIP TEMPORARY ASSISTANCE

Mr. McClellan: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Treasurer about the Ontario health insurance plan temporary assistance program. As members know, this program is designed to give free OHIP coverage to people whose income is temporarily interrupted by unemployment.

As closely as I can determine from the Ministry of Health's statistics, a relatively small percentage of the number of people who are on unemployment insurance in Ontario are receiving temporary assistance. Somewhere in the vicinity of 87,000 unemployment insurance recipients are receiving temporary assistance out of a total of 427,000 such recipients in the whole province.

Does the Treasurer not agree there is a serious problem with the temporary assistance program when it does not provide coverage to unemployment insurance recipients for the reason that the average weekly unemployment insurance benefit exceeds the eligibility cutoff line for temporary assistance?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I was just getting some statistics from the Minister of Health (Mr. Grossman) because, obviously, I would not know the exact figures. He is the minister who administers OHIP assistance through that office.

I would think there are a number of arguments one could use to determine whether the figure the member has used, 87,000 or whatever it is, is accurate or not. The other point one must remember is that many people in the work force are covered by other people's policies. If it is the only worker in a family or if both workers are out of work, I would think there is obviously a requirement for some assistance when resources

run down. In the last three or four years I think we have been remarkably effective in making people aware of the general levels of assistance for OHIP. Compared to statistics of a few years ago, I believe there has been an improvement.

11:20 a.m.

Mr. McClellan: I would agree with the Treasurer that they have improved, but the fact remains that there is a total of only 155,000 people on temporary assistance in Ontario. If he quibbles with my figure of 87,000, he still has tens of thousands of people who are receiving unemployment insurance who are not receiving temporary assistance under the OHIP premium assistance program. This is in addition to all of the other defects that have been documented since the select committee sat in 1978.

Does the Treasurer not think that surely it is time now? The evidence is overwhelming that the premium assistance program is not a success. It is too riddled with defects to be tolerated. Does he not think the time has come for him to implement the policy statement made in the 1979 budget that all low-income people in need of assistance should receive it—that is what the government said in 1979—and bring in a tax credit related to OHIP until such time as the government is prepared to move to additional reforms? Would the Treasurer not indicate today that he would be willing to consider in his next budget replacing the whole premium assistance program with a tax credit?

Mr. Speaker: Just one question, please.

Hon. F. S. Miller: If that was the question, the answer was no.

Mr. McClellan: So much for his concern about low-income people.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

CONSTITUTIONAL PROPERTY RIGHTS

Mr. Haggerty: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Deputy Premier regarding the announcement yesterday by the Premier which supported the amending of section 7 of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms to include the principle of the "right to enjoyment of property and the right not to be deprived thereof except in accordance with the principles of fundamental justice." Since this is the policy of the government of the day and this party supports and has encouraged the government in debate to seek amendments to section 7 of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, will the Deputy Premier, along with the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Pope) and the Minister

of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Mr. Bennett), now reconsider the present government policy regarding flood plain mapping in that the regulations now in effect do interfere with property rights and freedoms?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I will be very happy to direct the attention of my colleague the Minister of Natural Resources to that question. However, the honourable member will recall that in our area, that is, in the great Niagara region, the Minister of Natural Resources did sponsor a series of public meetings on this whole subject. Indeed, I think many people from the member's area were there making certain representations to a Mr. Ferguson.

The minister himself has met on two or three occasions with representatives of an organization that has been established under the chairmanship of a former mayor of Fort Erie to review this whole matter. It was my understanding that the minister would be getting back to the members of that association in due course after he had had an opportunity to reflect upon the report of his official and to give some further thought to the representations made to him directly by those people.

Mr. Haggerty: I do not think the present Minister of Natural Resources is moving in that direction as perhaps he should. I suggest that the Deputy Premier should be twisting the minister's arm to some degree for him to meet with the public in the Niagara Peninsula, not the deputy minister or some special assistant to his office. I suggest there should be a meeting called here before the Legislature to meet with them, along with the minister, perhaps under the standing committee on general government.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Perhaps the honourable member did not understand. The minister himself was there. He has met on two occasions. First, he was there speaking to the annual meeting, I think, of the St. Catharines Game and Fish Association. He came early and spoke to them. I think there were 30—

Mr. Haggerty: On this topic?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Yes, on flood plain mapping.

Mr. Swart: Mr. Speaker, recognizing that there is a need for flood plain mapping, but recognizing the arbitrary nature of the present legislation—that there is very little consultation and no route of notification or appeal by the individual—when the Deputy Premier is talking to the Minister of Natural Resources, would he suggest to him that perhaps this whole procedure should be brought under the Planning Act,

where the notification, appeal and hearing procedures are laid out, so that it would lose its arbitrary nature?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I think that has been the emphasis in the representations made by a number of people. Indeed, in the honourable member's own constituency, as he knows, where those meetings were held, I think many responsible people have urged that particular approach on the minister.

Mr. Rae: Are you suggesting he is not responsible?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Oh, no, he is very responsible.

Mr. Speaker: Never mind the interjections, please.

Hon. Mr. Welch: No doubt the Minister of Natural Resources will have an opportunity to comment on that when he is next in the House.

RELEASE OF INFORMATION

Mr. Nixon: On a point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker: I raise a matter that has been brought to your attention more and more frequently over the last few months, and that is the growing fact that government information and policy are released to the press before they are announced in this House.

I know it is your view that there is nothing you can do about this without a specific action of the House, but I want to draw to your attention that it is my recollection and clear understanding that always in the past the head of the government and the ministers have considered it their responsibility whenever possible to make announcements of government policy and of any new information that would be of importance in the province in the House first. Now more and more it has become difficult to determine what falls into that category, and more and more the ministers are having difficulty retaining the information among themselves and among their staff until such time as it can be announced.

I was particularly concerned when I read in the *Globe and Mail* this morning the following quote: "Adrian Hines, whose baby's death is one of the ones being investigated by police, is angry that word of the public inquiry is out and parents have yet to be informed." On another level of annoyance I read on the front page of the *Toronto Star* today, "MPP Ross McClellan is concerned because the *Star* knows about some government plans and reports before he does." The whole connotation is that there is something childish about any member getting

up in his place and objecting to our privileges being infringed.

In my view, privilege being infringed means that our ability to do our job and react as we are supposed to react on behalf of our constituents is being diluted and depreciated. It may be that there is nothing you can do about it, Mr. Speaker, even in a case as blatant as the one that happened over the last two days, where general information was released and then the minister, who probably has the very best press secretary of anybody in the government except possibly the Solicitor General (Mr. G. W. Taylor), gave out a specific piece of information, the name of the royal commissioner himself, for publication in the *Globe and Mail*. Maybe the *Globe* was a little sensitive that the *Toronto Star* had got ahead of it and somebody was balancing it up.

Frankly, I think the time has come when the government should do something about it if we cannot do something about it. I should just say as a suggestion that if this happens to a minister, the thing that really sets it straight for him personally is to indicate to the House that these leaks are without the minister's knowledge and that he is going to do something to try to tighten it up so that his first responsibility to the House is unimpaired.

Mr. McClellan: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk for raising this matter and again express a concern that I tried to raise yesterday with respect to it. The fact is that the information that there would be an inquiry into the deaths at the Hospital for Sick Children has been before the public for two full days without the terms of reference of that inquiry being available to members of this assembly, to the parents or to the general public for purposes of public scrutiny and discussion.

The problem is precisely as my colleague said. We are unable to do our job. It is not a question of being scooped or some petulance; it is a matter of not being able to do our job as opposition members to scrutinize, comment on and analyse the public business when information is being released to the public, if I may say, through media manipulation, through carefully arranged leaks to the press. The pattern suggests that is what is taking place and it is a violation of our privileges inasmuch as we are unable to do the job that we are elected to do if the government chooses to use this route to release information about its activities to the general public.

11:30 a.m.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, speaking generally on this, the point that has been made by my friend that this is somehow a case of government manipulation, prerulease of information and so forth, is just not correct. It is as much an embarrassment and a problem to us as it is to the members. It was as much an embarrassment to me as a member of this government to pick up the Toronto Star two days ago and read about something I knew my colleagues the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry) and the Minister of Health (Mr. Grossman) wanted to announce in this House and intended to announce, as was done this morning.

There was no manipulation or prerulease of that information, and the matter of how it got to the media and how the Globe and Mail and the Star had the name of the judge will still have to be studied and found out by the appropriate ministers. We believe, as the member believes, that the information should be made public in this House and it should be available to all members. I think there is a legitimate degree of concern.

Mr. Nixon: Is the minister sure the Attorney General agrees with him?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Yes, he agrees with me.

Mr. Nixon: He has never said so. Why does he not say so in here?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Members have a legitimate concern in this matter and in this area. If a minister goes out and holds a press conference and releases information rather than doing it here, we will argue on the grounds of whether that should be done and why that should be done. But in this case the intention of the government was to release that information and report and to make known the terms of reference and the name of the commissioner here in the House this morning in a statement. That it happened to get out before was not something this government wanted. The terms of reference were not completed until yesterday, well after that story appeared in the Toronto Star.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I really do not want to prolong this, but my colleague the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk has pointed out that surely it was incumbent upon the Attorney General to get up and say something about it or preface his remarks with that. I bring to your attention another example, after what the Conservative House leader has said.

The Premier (Mr. Davis) and the Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Drea) held

a well-attended and well-manipulated press conference yesterday at five o'clock in the Premier's office, in which they announced a program that is of concern to my colleague the member for Parkdale (Mr. Ruprecht) and others, without having made any statement about it at all here in the House. I understand even the Minister of Health did not know what was going to be announced at five o'clock.

Hon. Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, I find it amazing that the very people who encourage people to get documents to them or to the press, people who went around in a committee last year waving a stolen document with great glee, are now standing up and talking about how the minister makes public announcements.

Mr. Speaker: Dealing with the alleged point of privilege the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk raised, and as he himself has acknowledged it is not a proper point of privilege, as I have said before, it is beyond my jurisdiction. I just do not have any control on this. The government House leader has made his point clear.

The point of privilege raised by the member for Rainy River is something quite different and separate, and again not a point of privilege but rather a matter of courtesy. You have made your point and I am sure the government will take it into consideration.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I have a point of privilege. I would just like to say that I hope I was not incorrect in my feeling and remarks to you a moment ago in indicating I did not feel it was a point of privilege. I think I said I thought there was very little you could do without a motion of the House, because I believe anything that interferes with our ability to do our job should be raised as a point of privilege and corrected by the Speaker, if he possibly can.

I would also like to point out to the Speaker that much can be accomplished by even his comments on a matter like this. If he is quick to say that is not a point of privilege I would not say there is a sigh of relief over there, because they are not too concerned about these matters anyway, but do not let them off the hook too easily. I believe it is a point of privilege and if you were really to express just a little personal concern as our principal spokesman, our Speaker, these birds might smarten up.

Mr. Speaker: That is an interesting observation. I did not think I had responded too quickly. As a matter of fact, I heard the representatives of each of the parties and I gave it due consideration before I came to a conclu-

sion. However, you know as well as I do that I am governed by the standing orders and precedents and so on.

Just before we proceed any further, I think it is incumbent on me to acknowledge again and say thanks to the members for their conduct during question period. It is certainly a great improvement over past performances and I would hope it augurs well for the future.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Ruston moved, seconded by Mr. Boudria, first reading of Bill 17, An Act to amend the Legislative Assembly Act.

Mr. Ruston: Mr. Speaker, this is not a raise in pay. The purpose of the bill provides for a deduction of \$100 from a member's indemnity for each day of absence from the assembly while it is sitting unless the absence is because of illness, pregnancy, childbirth or other official business.

DENTURE THERAPISTS AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Swart moved, seconded by Mr. McClellan, first reading of Bill 18, An Act to amend the Denture Therapists Act.

Mr. Swart: Mr. Speaker, this bill would amend the present Denture Therapists Act to refer to denturists rather than denture therapists and would permit denturists to make, repair and market partial dentures without requiring supervision by dentists or dental surgeons.

11:40 a.m.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I would like to indicate the business of the House for next week. We will continue the debate on the speech from the throne. The leadoff speech from the third party will be on Monday afternoon, followed by other speakers taking part in the debate.

We will start night sittings next week. The throne speech debate will continue on Tuesday and Thursday afternoon and evening and on Friday morning. It will also continue on Monday, May 2, and on Tuesday, May 3, in the afternoon and evening. We expect the vote on the throne speech debate will be at 5:45 p.m. on Thursday, May 5.

It has been agreed to ask the table to calculate

the time after the leadoff speech from the third party until Tuesday evening, May 3, and apportion the amount of time to be used by the speakers equally among the three parties. The final windup speeches will be apportioned equally for time on the Thursday afternoon.

Next Wednesday morning, as is the custom the usual three committees may meet.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

STANDING COMMITTEES

Hon. Mr. Wells moved, seconded by Hon. Mr. Gregory, resolution 2.

Reading dispensed with [see Votes and Proceedings].

Motion agreed to.

COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIPS

Hon. Mr. Wells moved, seconded by Hon. Mr. Gregory, resolution 3.

Reading dispensed with [see Votes and Proceedings].

Motion agreed to.

COMMITTEE SCHEDULE

Hon. Mr. Wells moved, seconded by Hon. Mr. Gregory, resolution 4.

Reading dispensed with [see Votes and Proceedings].

Motion agreed to.

COMMITTEE BUSINESS

Hon. Mr. Wells moved, seconded by Hon. Mr. Gregory, resolution 5.

Reading dispensed with [see Votes and Proceedings].

Motion agreed to.

INTERIM SUPPLY

Hon. F. S. Miller moved, seconded by Hon. Mr. Wells, resolution 1:

That the Treasurer of Ontario be authorized to pay the salaries of the civil servants and other necessary payments pending the voting of supply for the period commencing May 1, 1983, and ending June 30, 1983, such payments to be charged to the proper appropriations following the voting of supply.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Mr. Speaker, since the Treasurer has not leapt to his feet to add to his motion I presume he does not have anything to add or say in this regard.

Carrying on from the points of order raised by the Liberal House leader earlier, we are being

asked this morning to vote to give the government authority to spend something like \$5 billion, if not more, between now and the end of June. I was glad to see the Treasurer withdrew his motion for a six-month approval by the House, and I therefore withdrew my motion making it a three-month period.

However, I think it should be incumbent upon the Treasurer to say something. I am disappointed in the Treasurer in this sense. I am referring again to the discussion that took place on the point of order. We had a federal budget three days ago in which the federal Minister of Finance outlined his views on the economy and what is going to happen not only this year but for the next four or five years. The House has not heard anything from the Treasurer in this regard except through the press. The comments that were attributed to the Treasurer, of course, are always editorialized, cut down and sometimes even misrepresented.

I was amazed the Treasurer of Ontario thought Mr. Lalonde should resign because of the so-called budget leak. I recall that last year in one of our ethnic newspapers there were two or three items, one particularly relating to the retail sales tax, that certainly seemed more of a budget leak in the sense that somebody could benefit by it than has happened at the federal level. The Treasurer, of course, pooh-poohed the thought that he should resign or even bother or deign to investigate that matter.

My point is this, I really think it was incumbent upon the Treasurer to stand in his place and tell us what he thought and what the view of Ontario was in terms of Mr. Lalonde's budget and how it was going to affect Ontario. He did not have to give us any thoughts, comments or previews of what the Ontario budget was going to be.

It is instructive that a few years ago, when Mr. Crosbie's budget came down, the Treasurer leapt to his feet to tell all and sundry, those who would listen with any interest at all, what he thought of that budget at that point. One can only presume from his relative silence that he thinks the federal budget was a relatively good one.

I am not here to say nice things about the federal government. I am more interested in finding out what the Treasurer and his staff of hundreds have done about analysing that budget and what impact it is going to have on Ontario. I have suggested before that I think it is incumbent upon the Treasurer of Ontario to make what I have called the reports on the state

of the economic situation for Ontario at some relatively stated times.

The Treasurer or his ministry puts out a report about every three months in which the revenues and expenditures are delineated and so on, and it would be incumbent upon the Treasurer at that time to give us an update on how he sees the economy of the province.

As I say, we are being asked to vote \$5 billion for the ordinary expenses of the province to pay civil servants' salaries and all that sort of thing, and the Treasurer has not deigned to give us any idea of, first of all, what amounts he will spend until the end of June without specific approval of the Legislature through the estimates procedures and, second, how he sees the economy of the province going.

I want to talk about one other matter. I want to know what the Treasurer anticipates he will be spending. I want to know how much of that will be going to job creation and, specifically, that of youth employment.

My colleague the member for Kitchener-Wilmot (Mr. Sweeney) asked the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Mr. Bennett) on April 19 about Ontario youth employment. My colleague pointed out at that time that the moneys coming from the Ontario government for this most important aspect of the unemployment situation in Ontario had been reduced by this government.

Both in terms of the program through the minister's budget and through the Experience program there has been a 22.2 per cent increase in the number of employed but the amounts of money have fallen from \$34 million to this year's \$23.7 million, and from serving 57,000 young people to only 41,000 this year, the youth experience program, through the government, has fallen by at least 300 people and there has been a cutback of funds in that area as well.

I do not wish to prolong the debate, but I do want to hear the Treasurer's reflections on the federal budget, its impact on Ontario and what amount of money we are voting. If he can give us a handle on that, because Management Board keeps a running tally month by month, and how he feels about the unemployment situation in Ontario and what, if any, moneys—I am presuming anywhere from \$5 billion to \$7 billion—will go into creating jobs in Ontario.

11:50 a.m.

Mr. Foulds: Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me say that we certainly do not intend to prolong the debate on this motion, but before you get

your enthusiasm up too high there are two or three major matters I would like to deal with.

The first point I want to raise with the Treasurer is that in my moments of recreational reading I occasionally browse through the Ontario Gazette. I noticed in the Ontario Gazette on Saturday, April 16, 1983—which was Purolated up to my office in Thunder Bay because it contained matters of such great pith and moment—there was a Management Board order for 1982-83 dated March 1, 1983. It had to do with the Ministry of the Attorney General and it looked as if there were substantial increases in the area of salary revision. It had to do with vote 1404-1 which, when I look at the estimates book, has to do with the criminal law division under the crown legal services. It had to do with vote 1406-3 which has to do with county and district courts, and it also had to do with vote 1406-5 which has to do with provincial courts.

Because I am new to the economic field, I would like to know why it was necessary for the Management Board order to be issued at that time. Is it because over the next couple of months substantial increases have to be spent in those areas and the minister needs that approval before he brings the estimates directly to the House? I noted vote 1406-3 in the Gazette, in particular, had additional funding for work load increase. I wonder if we could have a bit of explanation on that.

The major thing I want to talk about is my sense of disappointment that the Treasurer has not made at least a tentative official response to the federal budget. I know his budget is coming down in a few weeks and I certainly do not want him to scoop himself in terms of whatever press he can get out of that, good or bad. I found it just a bit disturbing, once again in terms of the matter we brought up earlier, that any response the minister has we get through the press rather than in a clear statement in the House. I think a short 10-minute statement this morning might have been extremely important and extremely worth while if we are to take the government's plans for economic recovery seriously.

The economic situation we face in the province is so severe and the unemployment situation is so serious that we need clear and decisive economic leadership at the provincial level. I have been unable to distinguish anything that differs between the federal Liberal government and the provincial Conservative government when it comes to general economic leadership in the last 10 years, because both governments

for the past 10 to 14 years have relied on four or five major operational modes.

One is, to try to pump the economy they have either given small tax concessions or holidays on consumer goods for brief periods of time. More important, they have tried to give concessions or incentives or giveaways to corporations.

During expansionary times and good times they have expanded their own budgets, but they have also budgeted deficits, and that is the most disturbing economic pattern that emerged in the last 14 years: that in good times they not only expanded their own spending but also expanded the deficit; there was deficit financing.

Now when times get bad, what do they both do? They engage in cutbacks, restraint—however we want to phrase it—and budget deficits. So although I have never been a great believer that deficits are necessarily bad, what has emerged is that in the last 14 years there has not been any pattern or sense or use made of budget deficits when they were necessary.

The most disturbing thing about both levels of government, even though it may have had overwhelming public support, is the fact that in the last year the wage restraint on public sector employees was the only economic initiative taken by either the federal or the provincial level of government. Frankly, I believe that both levels of government, by following the Reaganomics from south of the border, have deliberately created unemployment.

I want to put to the Treasurer that unemployment is the major problem and I want to put to him that unemployment in Ontario is the major problem; that there is no economic recovery worthy of the name until we start really creating jobs. Even though investor confidence may be up, even though banks may be making slightly more profit, even though companies and corporations may be making slightly more profit, all of that is to no avail for the populace as a whole until we start creating positive and full-time jobs. The depression, or the great recession—whatever term you want to use—is not over until those people start having jobs.

In the six weeks that we had off between sessions—

Mr. Conway: Off?

Mr. Foulds: We did not have them off; we had them back in our constituencies. They were a very important experience for many of us. They certainly were for me, because every week in the office we see unemployed people, men and

women, coming in to try to talk about the dignity of getting a job.

I will just use as an example a man who, because he was on unemployment insurance, moved out to the rural part of my riding where he had the opportunity of shelter at no cost. He had an opportunity for a job in the city, but he could not take that job in the city simply because he did not have the money either to get into housing in the city or to pay the transportation costs between his home in the country and his city job. There is no way around that in the bureaucracy, no way to find him a supplement, no way to find him public housing.

Then we realize that people are getting into very desperate straits and we know it is a depression and not a recession when one is shovelling snow in the driveway and the kid who delivers flyers stops to chat and asks if I can help his father find a job. We know when people take that kind of time to talk to us that we are in a very genuine depression.

12 noon

I do not want to go on too long, but I think the statistics over the last three or four months certainly bear that out. The thing that is depressing is that the statistics are not getting any better when it comes to unemployment. The latest ones indicate that Sudbury still has an unemployment rate of 27.1 per cent, Hamilton has an unemployment rate of 15.7 per cent, St. Catharines-Niagara has an unemployment rate of 17 per cent, Windsor 17.4 per cent and Thunder Bay 14.6 per cent—the first time in three or four months that Thunder Bay has been below the 17 per cent level. It is a major condemnation of this government that there are still 750,000 people in this province out of work.

To put it in a nutshell, I believe the strategy that was used in the Lalonde budget of an investment-led recovery is false. With the amount of unused capacity we have in our manufacturing sector in industry and with the debt load a number of corporations have, the kind of thrust Lalonde has tried will find the money simply going to retire the debt load rather than into new investment.

It is about time Treasurers called into serious question the theory of giving corporate grants and incentives. Recent studies in the research and development sector, for example, have indicated that government programs in Canada are relatively generous and relatively good in comparison to other jurisdictions in the world, yet we know the investment in research and development in Canada is relatively low.

Therefore, we have to get away from saying it is all right for governments to intervene to give corporate benefits, hoping the private sector will take those benefits and create jobs. If they are going to intervene and the objective is actually to create jobs, then the government must intervene more directly.

I would like to touch on two short-term and two long-term steps the Treasurer should consider while he is making his budget.

First of all, housing: Instead of cutting back on funds for nonprofit and co-operative housing—and I admit the federal government has done more of that than this government—funds should be dramatically increased. We still desperately need housing and single-family housing that people can afford. One of the few dynamic and growing areas that make that possible is the co-operative housing area.

Although I have no quarrel with municipal or provincial nonprofit housing, I think the co-operative housing area is one we could look at very creatively over the next year or so. That is what this government should do.

We still desperately need senior citizen and family units in every urban community in this province. As well as generating construction jobs in every major urban centre, that would, in my own parochial view, have a spinoff effect in northern Ontario because it would take up some of the slack in the woods and sawmill industry.

I also want to put in a plea that in the social services area we still desperately need crisis housing for battered women and children. Once again, renovation jobs, which would not be major ones but small ones spotted all over in every community in this province, would come first and then long-term social service jobs would follow.

I just want to mention three points in the long term; they all have to do with import replacement.

First, we could create 10,000 full-time, year-round jobs over the next 10 to 15 years if we simply developed a manufacturing industry for mining machinery we currently import to replace the mining machinery in this country that is worn out—building and manufacturing it here. I am sure we could create a similar number of jobs by producing the manufacturing machinery for the woods industries and pulp and paper industries in this province.

Second, I think it is crucially important that we start on a five- to 10-year plan to diversify the manufacturing base of the province. Despite the current catch phrase about the importance of high-technology industry, and I have no quarrel

with that, I do have the slight worry that both economists and government are looking at high tech as a quick fix, that for the next 10, 15 to 20 years our major jobs are going to be in our traditional industries, in manufacturing and the resource sector. Therefore, we must diversify that industry, both in northern Ontario and throughout southern Ontario.

Third, I think simply by insisting on our fair share of the auto parts manufacturing sector, we could dramatically improve the situation in southwestern Ontario and the Niagara Peninsula.

Those are the major suggestions I would like to make to the Treasurer at this time while he is thinking of putting together his budget. I would like to emphasize that I would like the Treasurer to seriously consider job creation in areas that are labour or job intensive, rather than capital intensive.

We do not need the kind of promise we got from Marc Lalonde that said, "We are on our way to recovery, but we can expect unemployment rates at the 12 to 10 per cent level for the next three years." We all know what an unemployment rate at the 12 to 10 per cent level means. It means continuing to have enormously high unemployment such as 27, 17 and 15 per cent in major urban centres in Ontario.

I would like to put it to the Treasurer that it is his job, now that there has been a failure to create jobs in the next two or three years at the federal level, to do so here at the provincial level.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I wanted to take the first opportunity—and this is the first opportunity and it is in order under a motion with respect to supply in the assembly—to bring to the attention of the assembly the serious default in the administration of the Ontario Securities Commission in the case of Norcen Energy Resources Ltd., which was before the commission and which has been the matter of question and discussion in the assembly. I want to do it as succinctly and as briefly as possible.

It is my misfortune, despite what—

Hon. F. S. Miller: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: May I ask is that in order for this interim supply debate?

Mr. Foulds: If I could speak to that point of order, Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that we are giving the Treasurer interim supply, that is, the money that the government spends in every ministry under the jurisdiction of the government in the next two months. That includes the expenditures under the estimates

of the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry) and the Solicitor General (Mr. G. W. Taylor) estimates, and I imagine it is the Attorney General's estimates under which expenditures for the Ontario Securities Commission come. Therefore, it is my contention that the topic of my learned and honourable friend the member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick) is very much in order.

12:10 p.m.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, if I may just speak to the point raised by the Treasurer, I believe that the subject is in order as well. I frankly think it might be discussed on some other occasion, but I know that whatever the honourable member is going to say about it will be useful and important. I would agree with what has already been said, that the funds made available for the next two months are going to be distributed among all ministries, unless the minister can assure us differently that they are channelled in some specific way other than that. I think our experience in the past over substantial objections has been that Mr. Speaker has allowed as wide a debate as the members of the Legislature saw fit to undertake.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Rotenberg): The point of order has been raised by the Treasurer. I would have to indicate to the House that a supply motion does cover funds for all agencies of the government, including the securities commission. I cannot comment on the wisdom of whether or not it should be raised at this time, but if an honourable member wishes to raise any matter that involves the spending of public money, that is in order.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I will not comment on the wisdom of it either. I obviously assume it is wise and important that the matter be raised at this time.

I have raised it because there is a very serious misunderstanding going to the root of the administration of the securities commission that must be cleared up. I want it to be understood that in the course of what I am saying this morning I am not making any imputation of any kind against any of the staff of the commission. I am not making any imputation of any kind with respect to the integrity or honesty of any member of the commission or of the staff. I am not making any comment, judgement or otherwise on the persons who are involved in the matters under consideration and the judgements that are involved in connection with them, nor am I making any comment with

respect to the ongoing police investigation into these questions.

What I do, however, want to say to the assembly I say because I happen, despite what the Attorney General said this morning, to have the misfortune to be one of the few members of the assembly who have some knowledge of a very specialized statute, the Securities Act of this province.

The securities commission exists solely and entirely by virtue of a statute of this assembly. It is not necessary in a parliamentary system of government to have a minor lecture in political science 1 at a university to say that the principle of government is that the minister is responsible to this assembly. I want to point out very clearly and very simply that the Securities Act describes and defines the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations as being the minister to whom the administration of this act is assigned.

Under the statute, a commission is created, the Ontario Securities Commission, which is responsible for the administration of the act. That commission is responsible to the minister and the minister is responsible to this assembly. The funds that are available to the commission are funds that are voted under the estimates of the government. The payments that are going to be made in this interim period are payments that are going to be made through the authority of this assembly.

With that minor introduction to the fundamental nature of the Ontario Securities Commission and its relation to this assembly, I want to say very clearly to the assembly that there has been a miscarriage of the administration of that commission in the matter relating to Norcen Energy Resources Ltd. and to the persons who were under investigation by the staff of that commission. It is a difficult question to get across to the assembly, a difficult point to make, but I am asking the members of the assembly to understand what I am saying.

The members heard on Tuesday of this week and again this morning the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry) and the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Elgie) refer to something called their version of that commission. I want to say to each of them and to my colleagues in the assembly that the statute provides the method by which investigations will take place by the commission when it is investigating questions that relate to offences under the Securities Act or offences under the Criminal Code.

The first point is a very simple and a very

direct statement, and that is that the decision by any body at any time as to whether charges will be laid against any person cannot be described as a legal matter or in any way as an administrative decision. It is in legal terms a quasi-judicial decision and that decision has to be made in accordance with the principles of natural justice. The investigation that was conducted in this case by the Ontario Securities Commission was an informal investigation. It was not carried out pursuant to the statute. The decision of the commission was made on the basis of informal information placed before it as a result of a very thorough investigation, and it had to do with the reputation of businessmen of prominence in Canadian business affairs.

As a citizen, I would object very seriously if a body was investigating me and making a decision with respect to whether I would be subject to any charges and that investigation was being carried out by the Ontario Securities Commission and it dealt with it as an administrative matter in accordance with the internal regulations of the commission when there is a statutory code that says how it is to be conducted.

That statutory code is set out very clearly in subsection 11(1) of the Ontario Securities Act, which states: "Where upon a statement made under oath it appears probable to the commission that any person or company has, (a) contravened any of the provisions of this act or the regulations; or (b) committed an offence under the Criminal Code (Canada) in connection with a trade in securities, the commission may, by order, appoint any person to make such investigation as it deems expedient for the due administration of this act, and in the order shall determine and prescribe the scope of the investigation."

When that investigator has been appointed, he has very significant powers and authorities granted to him in the Securities Act. In addition, he has the power to take evidence under oath and he has the obligation then to report to the Ontario Securities Commission. The commission, in making its quasi-judicial decision as to whether a charge will be made, must have regard to the provisions of section 12 of the Securities Act, which states: "Where upon the report of an investigation made under section 11 it appears to the commission that any person or company may have, (a) contravened any of the provisions of this act or the regulations; or (b) committed an offence under the Criminal Code (Canada) in connection with a transaction relating to securities, the commission shall send a full

and complete report of the investigation, including the report made to it, any transcript of evidence and any material in the possession of the commission relating thereto, to the minister."

Those are the salient considerations that we in this assembly by statute passed in 1978 detailed for the commission as the guide to be used if it was to proceed with any question about whether charges should or should not be laid against a person.

12:20 p.m.

Now I want to come to the very specific case which was of concern to the commission and very briefly try to make clear to the assembly what the question in issue was, what procedure was followed by the commission and why that procedure of the commission was a transgression of the statutory code imposed on that commission by the Securities Act.

On October 27, 1981, a company known as Norcen Energy Resources Ltd. issued a document which in technical securities terms is known as an issuer bid circular and in common, everyday terms as a prospectus, a special kind of prospectus. It was a prospectus by Norcen Energy Resources Ltd. notifying its own shareholders that it was prepared to bid in, to buy back from the shareholders shares of itself, the very same company that was making the offer. That circular had to comply with the provisions of the Securities Act and the circular which was issued contained these particular statements:

"Norcen has no present plans or proposals for material changes in its affairs, including no plans or proposals to liquidate, sell, lease or exchange all or substantially all of the assets of Norcen or to amalgamate Norcen with any other body corporate or to make any other major changes in the business corporate structure, management or personnel of Norcen."

It then contained this certificate: "The purchase of common shares of Norcen, in accordance with this purchase program and the contents of this notice of intention and its sending to shareholders, have been authorized by the board of Norcen. There are no material changes or plans for material changes in the affairs of Norcen which have not been generally disclosed."

The point at issue was whether or not there were material changes contemplated by Norcen Energy Resources Ltd. which should have been disclosed in that circular. In blunt terms, the question was whether or not the circular by reason of the failure to disclose was misleading and by reason of the failure to disclose there was

therefore a misrepresentation. The statute under section 118, which is the enforcement provision of the Securities Act, has this to say:

"Every person or company who makes a statement in any issuer bid circular that, at the time and in the light of the circumstances under which it is made is a misrepresentation, is guilty of an offence." The punishments are, in the case of a company, a fine of not more than \$25,000, and in the case of an individual, a fine of not more than \$2,000 or imprisonment for a term of not more than one year, or both.

So there are significant penal consequences to being charged with having made that kind of an offence, and due process, if it was not guaranteed before the Charter of Rights, is certainly guaranteed now. It was therefore essential that if allegations were going to be made that Mr. Edward G. Battle, the president and chief executive officer of Norcen Energy Resources Ltd., who signed this issuer bid circular, or Mr. Conrad Black, who was chairman of that particular company, were to be charged with issuing a false circular, then it behooved the Ontario Securities Commission to look very carefully at the process by which they go about making that determination and to do it in accordance with the due process which this assembly established for the Ontario Securities Commission. That is what took place.

There was an investigation, but an informal investigation, not the kind of investigation which we had stated in the statute of this province should be carried out by the commission. What did they do in April 1982 in the midst of a raging battle with respect to control of Hanna Mining Co. in Cleveland? While it is interesting as to what went on and people enjoy reading about that kind of matter, it is not significant to the point before us.

It is sufficient to say that Hanna Mining Co., through its solicitors, Davies, Ward and Beck, made a complaint to the Ontario Securities Commission in April 1982 with respect to this very question of whether this particular circular issued by Norcen Energy Resources Ltd. to its own shareholders was or was not a solicitors, Davies, Ward and Beck, made a complaint to the Ontario Securities Commission in April 1982 with respect to this very question of whether this particular circular issued by Norcen Energy Resources Ltd. to its own shareholders was or was not a false or misleading document.

By direction of the commission that investigation was stayed for a period of time because of reasons which, again, are irrelevant but which

are set out and can be read about in either the Financial Post or in the items which have been referred to as the fine articles in Maclean's magazine. All that information is available.

There was a preliminary report to the commission made by Mr. G. W. Curran and Michael J. Lang on September 1, 1982. Because they felt there were some serious questions that offences may have been committed, they proceeded to make a fuller and more complete investigation, but it was always an informal investigation. They were investigating charges against reputable and leading Canadian industrialists about offences they may have committed.

The commission had before it a preliminary report. That preliminary report indicated that, yes, the investigation should continue, and the commission allowed it to continue. That is where the commission made its mistake because at that point, or shortly thereafter or after a further direction to its investigating staff to come forward with a more definitive statement with respect to the investigation, there came a time when the commission was considering whether charges could be laid under the Securities Act or, indeed, whether any other offences were committed because it was their responsibility to that special commission, divorced from the administration of justice in this province, to deal with these matters in that way. But they failed.

The chairman at that time was Mr. Knowles. I carefully point out, as I said in my opening remarks, that I am not casting any aspersion on the integrity or honesty of any of the men then or now on the commission, but the error which was made, a fundamental error and a misconception by the commission if it directed its mind to it at all, was that it was looking into the question of whether Norcen Energy Resources Ltd. and certain of its officers, advisers and others had committed offences under the Securities Act or any other offences under the laws of Canada.

At some time, whether it was on September 1, 1982, when the preliminary report was made about the matter that there should be a further investigation, or whether it should have been after some further investigation, say, ending in October or November, the commission should have said, "Have we got a sworn statement before us on which we can act in accordance with section 11 of the act?"

12:30 p.m.

If they could not get a sworn statement before them, they should have stopped investigating it

and it should have been very clear to everybody that investigation had stopped. But at that point they were obligated, under any system of due process and in fairness to the people and the company which was being investigated, to have asked for and obtained that sworn statement.

Then they could have gone on in accordance with the way in which this Legislature had dictated they were to carry out that process, "Where upon a statement made under oath it appears probable to the commission"—it was their question to decide for themselves—"that any person or company has contravened any of the provisions of this act or the regulations, or committed an offence under the Criminal Code (Canada) in connection with a trade in securities, the commission may by order appoint" an investigator with full powers to make the investigation and report back.

It was only on the basis of that kind of a report and no other kind of a report that the commission had any jurisdiction from this assembly to decide whether or not the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations should be asked for the consent to prosecute under the provisions of section 118 of the Securities Act or whether or not the matter should be referred to the Attorney General.

Members will note, as I have said, if they came to that conclusion after that careful investigation in which they examined sworn evidence and all the reports of the investigator appointed pursuant to the statute, and if they decided, yes, there were probable grounds that offences had been committed under either the Securities Act or the Criminal Code, then the statute is mandatory: "The commission shall send a full and complete report of the investigation, including the report made to it, any transcript of evidence and any material in the possession of the commission related thereto, to the minister."

On the basis of that, if that was being handled, the minister was then charged with the responsibility of whether or not the process should be carried any further. That is due process. The minister then makes up his mind. If he is going to pursue the remedies to enforce the provisions of section 118, he must then, if he chooses, either give consent to the commission, if they have asked to proceed under section 118, or direct the commission if they have not asked him but his review of the report received from the commission is such that the charges be laid. A properly conducted investigation would deal with both aspects of the matter; that is, the

questions under the Securities Act and whether or not there were offences under the Criminal Code.

That did not take place. There was a detailed report with no sworn evidence of any kind, but making serious recommendations to the commission with respect to its obligations. I recited the appropriate part of that commission report to the assembly a few days ago.

In the recommendation of the investigators who conducted this informal investigation—when they are talking about whether or not the men and companies should be charged under the Securities Act, the informal investigation—their report said that the commission seek the consent of the minister pursuant to section 119 of the act to lay charges under section 118 of the act for 26 counts, eight against Norcen Energy Resources Ltd., nine against Conrad M. Black and nine against Edward G. Battle.

That report is dated March 24, 1983. It is limited to section 118 and was supported by this particularly forthright statement which I quoted to the assembly a few days ago. If I can find it again, it simply stated their views in very positive terms. This is the reason or the supporting statement of the investigators under this informal investigation:

"We are of the view that a strong case can and should be made in an appropriate forum that Norcen and certain of its individual officers broke the law by making false statements about and omitting to disclose an intention which constituted a material fact and decisions which constituted material changes within the meaning of the act."

What kind of due process is it where that kind of statement can be included in the report of an informal investigation by the Ontario Securities Commission that is going to deal with the question of whether or not a charge will be laid against a citizen under that act? What kind of process is that?

If one reads the comment of the minister in the last couple of days about this matter, he emphasizes it is an administrative act. One can go and ask any justice of the peace or any lawyer who knows anything about the processes of the law as to whether or not the question of whether a charge should or should not be laid against a citizen in this province is an administrative act. It is a quasi-judicial act, if it is not a judicial act. Because of the maladministration—and again, I emphasize without any fault—of that commission, we have this unfortunate circumstance of immense confusion about what has taken place.

This memorandum of March 24, the result of this investigation—which is very thorough, very complete within the limitations in which it was conducted, bearing in mind that it was informal—contains that kind of a recommendation on matters and charges on which the statute of limitations is going to run out at midnight April 12.

I am told that because the commission had three hearings to consider this report, one at the request of the Attorney General, and because they sat all day and all evening I am supposed to pat them on the back. I am not here to pat them on the back. Had they decided properly to have had a formal investigation then they would have deserved to have been patted on the back and told, "Yes, that is the way you were supposed to do it."

They came to a conclusion not to proceed any further. Do members realize that they could not have proceeded in any event? There was absolutely no way, after they had given consideration to the informal report of the investigators, that they could have now initiated the formal investigation under section 11, because the meetings all took place during the early part of April and the last meeting, of course, took place on the very day on which it would have expired.

I would say very clearly that even if the minister had consented on the basis of that informal investigation the matter could have been thrown out on the whole question of due process, because we in this assembly had said that if an investigation comes to the point where there is reason to believe as a result of that investigation there is some consideration of charges that should be laid, then the matter has to go the formal route and no other route.

I happen to feel very strongly about the due process of this matter, because ever since I have become involved in trying to follow it through I have been concerned about the commission and the way it has handled these matters.

12:40 p.m.

That leads me to my last comment on this particular matter, and that is the question of the conflict of interest of Mr. Peter Dey. I am not saying whether Mr. Dey was or was not biased or could have had a conflict of interest or not. This is not the point and it never was.

The Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations cannot take refuge in the point that Mr. Dey was making some decision of an administrative matter when he was deciding whether a charge would or would not be laid

against a citizen. That is not an administrative matter, that is a judicial matter in which he participated and the rules are very clear.

I will simply interpolate what I believe to be the test. The test, as far as I know, is whether or not the person making the decision—and Mr. Dey was one of a number of people—should participate in making a decision on whether or not charges should be laid.

"Does a reasonably well informed person have a reasonable apprehension that there may well be a biased appraisal and judgement of the issues to be determined?"

"The test of probability or reasoned suspicion of bias, unintended though the bias may be, is grounded in the concern that there be no lack of public confidence in the impartiality of adjudicative agencies. Emphasis is added to this concern in this case by the fact that the board is to have regard for the public interest."

One could read very clearly commission into that decision. That is the decision in a well known case, undoubtedly well known to everybody concerned. Mr. Dey was a partner in the law firm which was handling the securities matters related to Norcen Energy Resources Ltd. until the end of 1982. He took over as chairman of the commission from Mr. Knowles, I believe on January 4, 1983.

He was a partner in a law firm which was involved in the very matters which were before that commission. It is no satisfaction to a reasonably well informed person to say that he did not act on that particular file. It is of no satisfaction to me, as I believe a reasonably informed person, to believe that person should be asking whether or not he has a conflict of interest. If he had disqualified himself that would not have cured the fundamental error of the processes of the commission, but it would have maintained the integrity which the public expects from a chairperson of a commission of that importance.

I understand he asked his fellow commissioners whether they thought he would have a conflict and they assured him: "Oh no, you would not have a conflict. We have confidence in you." He apparently asked for an opinion. The very fact he had to ask supports the position which I think any reasonable member of the public would take that he should not have sat on the case in the first place.

I want simply to conclude. I took this occasion because this is a matter which cannot await these interjections by the Attorney General and the interjections by the Minister of Consumer

and Commercial Relations when they have a fundamental misunderstanding of the operations of that commission. The sooner they get with it and the sooner they understand it, the better.

The statute of limitations has run on section 118. The fundamental question has not been answered. The Attorney General is precluded from laying charges under section 118 of the Ontario Securities Act, whether he likes to admit it or not. The fact of the matter is there is an ongoing police investigation, which is another story and can be dealt with at the time that police investigation is concluded.

When we in this assembly establish a commission and provide very specific methods to protect by way of due process the character and reputation of persons who may have allegations against them, that charges may be laid under the Securities Act or, if it had been done properly, under the Criminal Code, they are entitled to the full panoply of the provisions of section 11 of the act and they are entitled to have the investigation conducted in accordance with those provisions that we have established. The failure by the commission to do so and its decision to substitute for it some informal investigation with respect to whether or not a citizen will or will not be charged is a matter that is of major and utmost concern.

It is with some diffidence that I always raise these kinds of questions in the assembly, because unfortunately the Securities Act is a relatively specialized area which is of interest to members of the public who are investors. But the integrity of the marketplace and the protection of persons who may be involved in those marketplaces have led to a special code being established.

The code is good. It is an excellent code. If it were adhered to by the commission that is appointed to carry it out we would not be in the mess we are in on the question of Norcen Energy Resources Ltd. and the question of who should or should not be charged.

I hope at some point the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations will take the trouble to read what I have said, to study the statute and to realize how improper the actions of the commission were in the way in which it dealt with the reputations of very important, leading Canadian industrialists. I make no judgement on any of those matters but I do say to the assembly that if we establish due process that commission must adhere to the due process that we establish.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment on the points raised by the first two speakers. Both asked me to make some critique of the federal budget. I will be pleased to do so.

To begin with, the thrust of the federal budget was a pleasant change of direction, in my opinion, from the one of 1981. It emphasized to a large degree assistance for the sector that I believe is capable of increasing the number of jobs in the country, the private sector.

It did not undo some of the actions in the 1981 budget felt to be punitive, such as the first-year 50 per cent capital cost allowance. However, to be fair, it includes a number of measures that should stimulate investment in equity and investment by equity holders or companies in new plant. Obviously, improvements in productivity and improvements in liquidity are essential if Canadian companies are to survive.

In the last year or two, particularly 1982, the folly of the attitudes of the 1960s and 1970s in corporate financing were particularly visible in Canada since, compared to American companies, we were heavily debt laden relative to equity. So we saw companies like Dome in very grave trouble when the cost of that debt increased dramatically.

Mr. Kerrio: Hydro.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Hydro has a very good debt-to-equity ratio. But let me carry on. Therefore, the emphasis on the indexed securities investment plan, the investor package that protects from inflation equity investments made after the budget date, should be welcomed.

12:50 p.m.

The capital works are harder to assess. The Minister of Finance tends to talk in multi-year numbers. That is a new technique. I understand the usefulness of it, because \$5 billion sounds like a lot more than \$1.2 billion. I believe though that while budgets should be able to give us some impression of future fiscal years they really only deal with one in a specific way. It particularly intrigued me when I saw tax changes that will occur in the next fiscal year included in this budget.

Mr. T. P. Reid: You raised personal income tax in Ontario in that manner.

Hon. F. S. Miller: No, I did that in my fiscal year. Those changes took place in my fiscal year. The calendar year was different, but the fiscal year was in that time frame. Please check that.

Mr. T. P. Reid: You announced a year in advance.

Hon. F. S. Miller: No, I did not. It became effective January 1 of the fiscal year during which my budget was announced.

The reason I could sort out in my mind, as a drafter of budgets, for announcing a future year's tax changes was not really to say they would occur on the dates mentioned, but I believe to give a slightly better picture to the cash requirements shown down the road, to indicate a change in attitude towards deficits. I hope this is a fact. I hope the federal government is going to start reducing its deficit, because \$31 billion of \$89 billion is being borrowed.

Opposition members quite properly come after me day after day about the size of my predicted deficit. Mine was \$2.2 billion on \$22 billion. I think one has to look at the difference between those two.

Mr. T. P. Reid: It is going to be a little higher than that.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Sure it is, but I point out that a year ago Mr. MacEachen predicted a \$7-billion cash requirement for a year that ended up having a \$23-billion or \$24-billion cash requirement, over three times his original estimate. Mine is up between 10 and 15 per cent. His was up 300 per cent.

Other measures in the budget I believe worthy of support are the registered home ownership plan measures that allow people to top up the \$10,000 towards the purchase of a home and/or take money out this year for furnishings and appliances for an existing home without losing their rights to the RHOSP. I believe several provinces had suggested this move. We support it. We believe it will help basically Canadian industries' sales just as much as a sales tax holiday would have helped. It gives people an immediate tax incentive to make a decision.

The Canada-Ontario employment development program, or the new employment expansion and development program as it is called at the federal level, was extended by about \$180 million. In the last couple of months my concerns about the COED program being structured too tightly have diminished a bit.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Mine have not.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Just a second, I said a bit. I am going to qualify that very quickly. My concerns still deal with the public service aspects of COED and NEED, in that we cannot take tenders, we have problems with union agreements and we have a number of difficulties in getting people back to work as the programs are

structured. Yesterday we saw a city having to turn down a program because it would have involved hiring nonunionized people when unionized people were involved or had a right to certain priorities.

I would argue that the part that has surprised the federal government, and was only there because of Ontario's request, was the small business part. As the last two or three months have gone by, the small business sector has suddenly realized, almost all around the province, that money is available that can help it put on needed additions, usually on a 50-50 basis or something close to it. It doubles the total impact of government dollars, quadruples the federal share, since we match it in most cases; and, most important, puts in place an asset some businessman believes will make a profit. Not only are jobs created but an asset is improved.

I have to speak on behalf of the tourist industry; I am sure the member for Rainy River (Mr. T. P. Reid) would too. This has been an important opportunity for the tourist industry and many others, but particularly the tourist industry, to winterize, to renovate, to expand, to add a couple of units, whatever. Those are in our long-term as well as our immediate economic interest.

The biggest single problem then remains, in my opinion, the deficit. The tax changes incorporated in the budget did cost Ontario about \$82 million in lost revenue in this fiscal year, so we will have that immediate loss of revenue because we either are going to be paralleling or are affected by some of the changes, or traditionally we do. I of course have to make those decisions, but traditionally Ontario has tried for simplicity to parallel federal corporate income tax moves.

I was asked to estimate the number of billions of dollars that would be spent between now and June 30. Five billion dollars would probably be low. I would be inclined to think it is closer to \$7 billion or \$8 billion, since the cash flow in the first quarter of the fiscal year generally is at one of its heavier points. That is one of the reasons I

borrowed some money in the marketplace the other day.

The Management Board orders mentioned by the member for Port Arthur (Mr. Foulds) are something I am not able to answer. I simply cannot. The Chairman of Management Board (Mr. McCague) would be the appropriate person to answer that, and I am afraid the members opposite will have to get an answer from him.

The honourable member was saying, though, that he really did not see anything different between the Ontario government and the federal government with respect to fiscal management. I, of course, would argue that the fundamental difference in the two governments has been fiscal responsibility over the years. Why, for example, is the total funded debt of the province of Ontario in this year about 12 months' revenue whereas in Mr. Frost's day it was 22 months' revenue and—who was the last Liberal Premier? Mr. Nixon?—in Mr. Nixon's day it was about 43 or 44 months' revenue?

Mr. T. P. Reid: You are excluding Ontario Hydro.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Ontario Hydro has an 80 per cent debt-to-equity ratio. It has maintained a ratio of something on that order. It tends to put part of each year's profits into new construction and to borrow the balance. That is not unlike many other corporations that are expanding.

Mr. T. P. Reid: But that is not part of your equation.

Hon. F. S. Miller: No it is not, because it stands on its own. It earns its own money to pay its own bonds.

Mr. Speaker, I would gladly have gone on a bit, but at this point I would ask that my motion be passed.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, obviously we do not have time to proceed with the other remaining motion on the order paper today, so we will leave it for another occasion.

The House adjourned at 1 p.m.

CONTENTS

Friday, April 22, 1983

Statements by the ministry

McMurtry, Hon. R. R., Attorney General:	
Deaths at Hospital for Sick Children.	92
Norton, Hon. K. C., Minister of the Environment:	
Niagara River water quality.	91
Wiseman, Hon. D. J., Minister of Government Services:	
Pilot project in telecommunication services.	91

Oral questions

Birch, Hon. M., Provincial Secretary for Social Development:	
Neighbourhood support services, Mr. Conway, Mr. R. F. Johnston.	96
McMurtry, Hon. R. R., Attorney General:	
Deaths at Hospital for Sick Children, Ms. Copps, Mr. Rae.	95
Deaths at Hospital for Sick Children, Mr. Rae, Ms. Copps.	97
Security of tenure in rental units, Mr. Rae, Mr. Philip.	98
Norcen Energy Resources Ltd., Mr. Renwick, Mr. Nixon.	100
Miller, Hon. F. S., Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics:	
OHIP temporary assistance, Mr. McClellan.	104
Norton, Hon. K. C., Minister of the Environment:	
Niagara River pollution, Mr. Kerrio, Mr. Charlton.	103
Stephenson, Hon. B. M., Minister of Education and Minister of Colleges and Universities:	
Education for mentally handicapped, Mr. Bradley.	101
Education for multiply handicapped, Mr. Grande.	102
Timbrell, Hon. D. R., Minister of Agriculture and Food:	
Tile drainage, Mr. Ruston, Mr. Boudria.	99
Welch, Hon. R. S., Minister of Energy and Deputy Premier:	
Constitutional property rights, Mr. Haggerty, Mr. Swart.	105

First readings

Legislative Assembly Amendment Act, Bill 17, Mr. Ruston, agreed to.	108
Denture Therapists Amendment Act, Bill 18, Mr. Swart, agreed to.	108

Government motions

Standing committees, resolution 2, Mr. Wells, agreed to.	108
Committee memberships, resolution 3, Mr. Wells, agreed to.	108
Committee schedule, resolution 4, Mr. Wells, agreed to.	108
Committee business, resolution 5, Mr. Wells, agreed to.	108
Interim supply, resolution 1, Mr. F. S. Miller, agreed to.	108

Other business

Release of information , Mr. Nixon, Mr. Wells, Mr. McClellan, Mr. T. P. Reid, Mr. Drea . . .	106
Business of the House , Mr. Wells	108
Adjournment	119

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Birch, Hon. M., Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Scarborough East PC)
Boudria, D. (Prescott-Russell L)
Bradley, J. J. (St. Catharines L)
Charlton, B. A. (Hamilton Mountain NDP)
Conway, S. G. (Renfrew North L)
Copps, S. M. (Hamilton Centre L)
Drea, Hon. F., Minister of Community and Social Services (Scarborough Centre PC)
Elgie, Hon. R. G., Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (York East PC)
Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP)
Grande, T. (Oakwood NDP)
Haggerty, R. (Erie L)
Johnston, R. F. (Scarborough West NDP)
Kerrio, V. G. (Niagara Falls L)
McClellan, R. A. (Bellwoods NDP)
McMurtry, Hon. R. R., Attorney General (Eglinton PC)
Miller, Hon. F. S., Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics (Muskoka PC)
Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
Norton, Hon. K. C., Minister of the Environment (Kingston and the Islands PC)
Philip, E. T. (Etobicoke NDP)
Rae, R. K. (York South NDP)
Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L-Lab.)
Renwick, J. A. (Riverdale NDP)
Rotenberg, D. (Wilson Heights PC)
Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
Stephenson, Hon. B. M., Minister of Education and Minister of Colleges and Universities (York Mills PC)
Swart, M. L. (Welland-Thorold NDP)
Timbrell, Hon. D. R., Minister of Agriculture and Food (Don Mills PC)
Turner, Hon. J. M., Speaker (Peterborough PC)
Welch, Hon. R. S., Minister of Energy and Deputy Premier (Brock PC)
Wells, Hon. T. L., Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Scarborough North PC)
Wiseman, Hon. D. J., Minister of Government Services (Lanark PC)



Hansard

Official Report of Debates

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Third Session, 32nd Parliament

Monday, April 25, 1983

Speaker: Honourable John M. Turner

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

Contents of the proceedings reported in this issue of Hansard appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of the speakers taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is \$15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, Information Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 965-2238.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Monday, April 25, 1983

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

STATEMENT BY THE MINISTRY

SALE OF SCIENCE CIRCUS

Hon. Mr. McCaffrey: Mr. Speaker, earlier today I attended a ceremony in the Premier's office that I would like to recount to members of the House because it concerns one of the major themes outlined in the speech from the throne, namely "to promote and encourage the development of internationally competitive industries."

These words underline this government's renewed commitment to double Ontario's exports over the next few years, especially the export of manufactured goods and, most especially, products of Ontario's high-technology industries. The Ontario government is determined that Ontario's industries can, should and will compete in the toughest marketplace of all, the world outside our borders.

Thus I am pleased to announce that the Ontario Science Centre, a crown agency of my ministry, has just signed a \$700,000 contract for the sale of a science circus to Japan. This marks the first time that such an important element of Ontario technology and craftsmanship has been sold abroad.

The science circus is a highly sophisticated yet portable exhibition that will tour the cities and towns of Japan. It will supplement a similar circus also to be developed by the science centre that will in the near future tour other countries in the Far East under the auspices of this government.

The sale of the science circus is important to Ontario for a number of other reasons, not the least of which is that it alone will represent nearly half of one per cent of Canada's manufactured exports to Japan. As members know, Canada's exports with Japan have been primarily raw materials, which are then manufactured in Japan and sold back to Canada, so I know that all members will share my pleasure that an agency of the Ontario government, one devoted to science and culture, should be at the forefront of such a crucial and long overdue initiative in Canadian trade.

Another benefit of the sale of the science circus to one of the world's most advanced technological countries is that it will save and create jobs in our province. The science circus will be built entirely in Ontario by Ontario craftsmen, designers and manufacturers using Canadian-made materials and resources.

The idea of a science circus was first developed by the Ontario Science Centre in 1973. It was refined over the past decade when it toured hundreds of cities and towns across our province, the country and internationally. In 1981, the circus visited the Science Museum in London, England. It also visited Birmingham and Montreal, drawing crowds in excess of 10,000 people per day.

With this experience and with requests coming in from around the world either to take the circus on tour or consult in the building of indigenous science centres modelled on our own, the Ontario Science Centre has once again confirmed its international leadership both in communications technology and in the highly complex field of participatory exhibit design. That latter phrase means the hands-on type of exhibits the Ontario Science Centre is famous for.

But why is this sale, under \$1 million after all, so important?

For one, I am confident it will lead to other sales in other countries. Thus it will provide hands-on learning experience in science to children and adults around the world. In developing countries especially, it will make science and technology accessible to nontechnical people.

It will also generate considerable goodwill for our province and Canada and focus attention on our high technology components and consumer products.

What is more, by tying science to trade, the science circus will help focus attention on Ontario trade activities in foreign countries and by tying science to tourism it will encourage visitors from abroad to discover Ontario. After all, the Ontario Science Centre is already one of our province's most important tourist exhibits.

That mandate was reiterated in the speech from the throne and I know members will look forward to similar statements from my col-

leagues in the next few weeks concerning other new initiatives taken by this government to play a leading role in the province's economic recovery.

ORAL QUESTIONS

CLOSURE OF CONSOLIDATED-BATHURST PLANT

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, before I start, I think the word should go out that it is most disrespectful of this corporal's guard of ministers not to be at the Canadian Club listening to the new vision from Brampton. I think you should make note of that and pass on to the Premier (Mr. Davis), Mr. Speaker, that they are not there.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps you could spread the word.

Mr. Peterson: I was just trying to be helpful to you, sir.

I have a question for the Minister of Labour with respect to the immediate closing, I understand tomorrow, of the Consolidated-Bathurst Packaging plant in Hamilton. The minister has been involved in these negotiations and he is, no doubt, aware there is the threat of an immediate termination of some 140 jobs in addition to the 80 or so who have already been laid off.

I am sure the minister is also aware there have been some discussions and some initiatives put forward by the employees as to a potential employee takeover-buy-out of that plant. Could the minister bring this House up to date as to the state of those negotiations and what is happening there?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, I am hesitant to say that particular problem has had any higher priority than any other plant closure, but it seems to have had, at least from a time-consumption point of view. We have had meetings with union representatives and company representatives, and telephone conversations with local, regional and municipal politicians and staff persons in an attempt to try to find a resolution to this.

I must admit I am disappointed with the company's attitude. To date, we have made some requests of the company which I think were reasonable. In fairness to them, they have given consideration to them but for various reasons they have thus far seen fit to disregard such requests as a meeting convened by myself with management and union officials to try to reach agreement on some of the outstanding points.

We are still hopeful we can convince the company it should at least keep the plant open for another month to give the economic council in Hamilton, the unions and the other officials involved, an opportunity to reach some sort of satisfactory alternative arrangement.

2:10 p.m.

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, there are certainly press indications that the federal government may be willing to participate in assisting the employees in a buy-out of those facilities. Certainly that is a preliminary indication.

Is the minister prepared, on behalf of his government, to offer the same kind of assistance in this matter to try to keep the plant open and, in the short-term, to continue those discussions with help from both the federal and provincial governments so that, hopefully, we can keep that plant in operation?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any commitment by the federal government to provide financial assistance. I can advise the honourable Leader of the Opposition that there is a meeting that started at 1:30 p.m., and it is going on right now, between officials of my ministry and officials from the Ministry of Industry and Trade.

I certainly cannot stand in my place today and indicate that money would be available. I can certainly indicate that every possible support and consideration would be given to this very serious problem, just as it is to every plant closure that comes upon the scene these days.

Mr. Mackenzie: Mr. Speaker, I am wondering if the minister is aware that, in a telegram to the union, Consolidated-Bathurst has flatly refused to discuss selling the plant to the workers, even though they are prepared to put forward an offer.

Is the minister also aware that the regional council in the community, some of his Tory friends, the mayor and regional chairman, Anne Jones, feel that the company's actions are contemptible? Given this kind of a position, is the minister ready to guarantee that the machinery will not be moved out of that plant at least until such time as the employees have an opportunity to put a presentation before the company in Montreal? Will he put whatever pressure he can on them through the federal and provincial governments?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the telegram. In fact, I have a copy of the telegram, and I talked with the company official

who wrote the telegram before it was written and after it was written. I have expressed my concern and disappointment. I have tried to persuade them to act otherwise.

I do not know what my Tory friends have to do with this particular circumstance because I do not approach the problems brought to me on the basis of them having come to me from a Tory, a Liberal or a member of the New Democratic Party. In fact, the honourable member knows full well that the first meeting we had was set up by himself upon a request to me.

It is true that I have been in touch on several occasions with the regional chairperson, and with the mayor. In fact, I was in touch as late as this morning with the regional chairperson. Yes, certainly, I will do everything that I can do within my power to persuade the company to give some time so the possibility of a buy-out, a purchase or a co-operative arrangement can be made involving the union officials and the union persons.

I repeat what I said to the Leader of the Opposition just a moment ago. A meeting is going on at this time between my officials and the Ministry of Industry and Trade. I am to be briefed on the outcome of that meeting just as soon as I return from question period this afternoon.

Ms. Copp: Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the Minister of Labour not only gets a briefing on what happens at that meeting but also provides some leadership to make sure that if government funding is necessary it can also be added to the pot to help the employees in the buy-out.

Since only two months before the closing was announced Consolidated-Bathurst signed a three-year agreement with the employees' union, has the minister investigated the possibility that the company bargained in bad faith, and/or possibly wrongfully dismissed the employees?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the union is considering the laying of charges against the company for bargaining in bad faith. If it does so that would be heard, of course, by the Ontario Labour Relations Board. Therefore, I would not want to make any further comment at this particular time.

APPOINTMENT OF POLICE CHIEF

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Solicitor General with respect to the mess

that developed with the police commission in London, Ontario.

The minister will no doubt be aware that one of the police commission members, one of his appointees, chose to have secret meetings with respect to the choosing of a new chief, and he will also be aware that the mayor has refused to sit on the police commission. As a result, there is no progress whatsoever towards the choosing of a new chief and the previous chief has already left office.

May I ask the Solicitor General what he is doing from his good offices to resolve this very embarrassing situation?

Hon. G. W. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, unlike the Leader of the Opposition, we do from time to time work on these matters and do not call press conferences; we reply through different means. I have been working on the matter; I have been discussing the matter with the Ontario Police Commission. The chairman of the Ontario Police Commission will be attending in London tomorrow.

On the matter of the mayor of the city of London deciding he was not going to sit on the commission, I find that most regrettable in that he does have a statutory duty as the mayor of the municipality to sit and carry out his duties under the law as a statutory person on the local police commission. The other two members are willing to serve.

The fact that somebody might have—and I say might have—used, somewhat in hindsight, some bad judgement or an unwise procedure to have consulted with different potential candidates for the chief's position, I do not find that, as some have been saying, in the nature of something that requires a public inquiry to sort out the problem.

I do not describe it as a mess; I just describe it as somebody who might not have, in hindsight, had those discussions with potential applicants for the job. But I do not find it such as to require a public inquiry or even to call for the person's resignation.

Mr. Peterson: It appears there is an impasse. It is not being helped by the minister's colleague, the minister of industry and tourism, the member for London South (Mr. Walker), who is now going around saying those nine people inside the force who applied for the job now apparently have withdrawn their applications because of the embarrassment they have been put through—at least three of them have been put through—by this one commissioner who

decided to interview candidates on his own. The whole thing, as the minister will know, is at this point at an impasse and nothing is happening, which is affecting very seriously, from the report that I get, the morale of the London police force.

Since the minister has dismissed the possibility of having an inquiry of any type, what is he going to do to solve that problem now, so it does not further deteriorate over the next few months until the lapse of the appointment of this one offending commissioner?

Would the minister not agree that he has a responsibility in that regard and would it not be constructive on his part to ask the offending commissioner to do what he previously said he would do, i.e. resign, so that we can bring back the appearance of fairness and equity in this process of choosing a new chief in London? Surely that is not beyond the Solicitor General's power and is not unreasonable in the circumstances.

Hon. G. W. Taylor: I presume the Leader of the Opposition was referring to the Minister of Industry and Trade and not industry and tourism. I suppose he is about as up to date on this matter as he is on that one.

However, I will bring him up to date. The chairman of the police commission is attending tomorrow to discuss the matter with the—

Interjections.

Hon. G. W. Taylor: I find it very exhilarating that when one corrects the opposition it is not permissible, but when they are at pains to correct us, it is quite permissible. However, I will continue on in my brief conversation here.

The chairman of the Ontario Police Commission is going down to London tomorrow to discuss the matter with them. I find that a very reasonable solution to the problem, and do not, as has been requested by some people in the area, feel a royal commission or inquiry would be the only way to solve this problem. That would far out-distance this problem; it is certainly not that difficult a problem to solve. I would suggest that if the mayor, those aspirants for the job and the police commissioners were to get on with the job and complete the interviewing of individuals, the new chief would be chosen and the problem resolved.

2:20 p.m.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, what exactly is the chairman of the Ontario Police Commission going to discuss with the chairman of the

London Police Commission at the meeting tomorrow?

Hon. G. W. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, I would suspect, as has been suggested, that the chairman will discuss with them, as I have concluded that the problem is not all that large and that he will suggest to them that they continue and complete the process of choosing the new chief of police.

It is not a major difficulty that has arisen here, and I certainly would not ask for the resignation of the commissioner. Certainly the situation is not one where I would instruct or give information to my cabinet colleagues that they request a resignation of the present police commissioner.

Mr. Peterson: What is happening is that the offending commissioner is getting passive if not active support from both this minister and the Minister of Industry and Trade (Mr. Walker), and I thank him for helping me with that matter.

But does this not speak to the broader issue as well, the whole matter of who can sit on a police commission, the majority being elected hands or appointed hands? Does it not speak to the entire matter of choosing a police chief and of conflicts of interest of potential police commissioners? The minister is aware that the offending police commissioner already has a conflict of interest in that one of his relatives is a member of the police force.

Does the minister not feel it is important, given this problem, now to review the entire matter and come forward to this Legislature with new rules with respect to this entire matter?

Hon. G. W. Taylor: As the Leader of the Opposition is aware, the Police Act, which that portion of the situation comes under, is presently under review, and there will undoubtedly be some increase in the number of members on the commission but no change in their majority or in how they will be appointed.

CANADA PACKERS LAYOFFS

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour about the Canada Packers layoffs. How does the minister feel about the very basic sense among a great many workers at Canada Packers that it was statements made by many people, such as the member for High Park-Swansea (Mr. Shymko), particularly during the announcement of the Board of Industrial Leadership and Development program, about the potential for closing the stockyards that

contributed to the uncertainty with respect to the investment decisions of Canada Packers?

How does the minister respond to charges about the government's failure to act on the report of Mr. Kelly, published in the summer of 1982, calling on the government to take steps right away and saying: "We believe it is important that the Ontario government act on these recommendations immediately. The uncertainty about the future of the stockyards is delaying several companies in the meat packing complex from going ahead with their plans to upgrade their facilities"?

How does the minister respond to the charges that it is this kind of delay over the past two or three years that has directly contributed to the decision of Canada Packers to terminate their operation next to the stockyards and to leave 950 workers out in the cold?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, since that announcement was made I have been more concerned with the plight and the future of the 950 workers from Canada Packers and the possible spinoff effects on other workers at the stockyards than I have been with the rhetoric that has gone on over the past couple of years as to the future of the stockyards. I really believe that the leader of the third party should have directed this question to someone other than the Minister of Labour.

Mr. Rae: I thought he was responsible for plant closures, and that is exactly what we have seen.

Does the minister agree with the statement of the Deputy Minister of Agriculture and Food that this closure was "inevitable and an essential rationalization. Frankly, it has come four or five years too late"?

As the minister responsible for protecting the workers of this province does the Minister of Labour agree with that kind of statement coming from the Deputy Minister of Agriculture and Food?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, I am concerned with the rationalization given for every plant closure. It seems to me that up until a few months ago most of the plant closures we had to deal with came about through bankruptcies or receiverships.

Mr. Mackenzie: Not so.

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Hear me out, please. I said up until a few months ago. I was going on to say that in the last number of months I have been disturbed by the number of closures that have

been brought about by rationalization. That is the problem we are trying to attack at this time.

Mr. Sweeney: Mr. Speaker, given the fact that the food processing business is a very important part of Ontario industry and a very great source of employment in the province, which obviously the Minister of Labour would be concerned about, can the minister indicate to us how the obvious differences between the member for High Park-Swansea wanting to get the stockyards out of that particular area, and the attitudes and expressions of the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Timbrell) saying it is quite fine to leave it there, are going to be reconciled on the basis of the entire processing industry in that area trying to make some decision as to where it is going to go and the employment opportunities?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, rightly or wrongly, I really have not concerned myself as to the comments of the member for High Park-Swansea or the Minister of Agriculture and Food in respect to the stockyards. I have been more concerned about the jobs that are affected there. In that regard, I strongly believe it was the intervention of my ministry and myself personally in getting Canada Packers to agree to first refusal in their other operations for employees who are affected by this particular closure.

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, the minister's surprise at the process of rationalization would be quaint were its effect not so devastating on the workers, because the rationalization that is taking place in many industries in this province is the human face of recovery which the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) has been talking about over the last few days.

Instead of going on his hands and knees to companies asking them to delay things or change their minds, does the minister not think it is time we had legislation in this province requiring companies to justify plant closures so the government would be able to protect workers instead of simply letting them go to the wall every time a company decides it wants to make some more money?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: I do not believe I used the term "surprised" about rationalization. I believe I used the words "concerned and worried" about rationalization.

Let me answer the honourable member's question with a question. What is his answer? Does he believe that public takeover is the answer to the problem?

Interjections.

PROTECTION OF WORKERS

Mr. Mackenzie: Mr. Speaker, I have another question for the Minister of Labour. The minister is well aware that to the Consolidated-Bathurst plant we were discussing just a few moments ago it is a question of rationalization. That rationalization assists the company, but 141 skilled workers with better than 20 years' seniority are out on the street. The same is the case with Flavorite Poultry, PPG Industries, H and R. Johnson and a number of plants in Hamilton—all rationalization.

Why will the minister not take a look now—quickly, before it is too late for some of these workers—at legislation? Public justification, the community adjustment fund and the longer notice period are all suggestions made by this party and rejected by the other parties in this House. Why will he not now move in those areas to protect workers in Ontario? It is obvious we have a problem with rationalization of production.

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, this province does not have to apologize to anyone for its severance arrangements, notices and so on. We are the only province in the country that has such legislation. There is only one jurisdiction in the United States and that is Maine and it comes nowhere close to what we have. As far as extensions or refinements of the present legislation are concerned, we are constantly looking at that.

Mr. Mackenzie: The minister would not establish a commission of inquiry in this case. Why is it so easy to pass legislation to protect the depositors of Crown Trust but we cannot seem to get through legislation when it is urgently needed, such as in the case of Consolidated-Bathurst and the other plants? When will he bring in legislation that is going to give them some protection?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: I cannot give any commitment to the honourable member at this time that legislation will be introduced in the near term.

2:30 p.m.

Mr. Wrye: Mr. Speaker, in his first answer, the minister referred to the severance pay legislation that he claims his government is so proud of. Does he not think after almost two years of work with the severance pay legislation that the time has come to re-examine it? Does he not think the time has come to reduce the minimum number of employees involved and

the minimum period of work involved from five years to one year? Further, does he not think it is time to look at redefining what, for example, a permanent discontinuance is? Does he not think it is time to bring in some amendments to that severance pay legislation?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, I believe that is the same question the member for Hamilton East (Mr. Mackenzie) asked in different phraseology. It is time—I agree with the honourable member—it certainly is time to re-examine the legislation. That is what is going on within our ministry right now.

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, how does the minister expect that kind of statement to have very much credibility with us when it was contained in the speech from the throne in 1982 and nothing was done, and when it was not even mentioned in the speech from the throne in 1983? How does he expect his statements with respect to severance pay to have any weight, at all in this Legislature when the government has dropped that specific commitment it made and did not keep in 1982?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, we have not dropped any commitments that were made in the throne speech in 1982.

ONTARIO HOME RENEWAL PROGRAM FUNDS

Mr. Epp: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing regarding OHRP, otherwise known as the Ontario home renewal program. Would the minister explain why \$10.5 million of 1981-82 funds that had been committed to the Ontario home renewal program were quietly reallocated last October? Since the minister never bothered to inform us of this removal of the funds from that program, this reordering of the priorities, would he now indicate the specific program or programs to which the funds were reallocated?

Despite the minister's weak murmurings about his supposed generosity in allowing municipalities to recycle their reserve funds, the number of grants that can be offered through this process is pathetically small. How can the minister, who boasts that Ontario residents enjoy the highest-quality housing in the world, possibly justify strangling a program that is so desperately needed in the difficult economic times we are facing?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, you will recall that this program has been under way for some period of time in the province. Indeed, it

has been one of the programs that the government of Ontario alone has funded, no one else. There has been no participation by either municipal or federal governments. It has been going on for a period of about seven years. We have a total of something close to \$140 million that we have given out that has been administered by the local municipalities and allocated to the various needy people in their communities.

I said to the communities, "Yes, in the current budget year we are looking very seriously at the elimination of that program." That does not mean to say that some reconsideration or other thoughts about renovation and rehabilitation programs will not come about over the next period of time. I did say very clearly to the municipalities that the way the program was originally established afforded them the opportunity to allocate the money and to write off certain portions of it, but also to collect back the loans from the individuals. We believe after seven years there is developing a fairly interesting amount in a rollover account for most municipalities. That is one of the reasons we have ceased the program.

Mr. Wrye: Mr. Speaker, the minister will recall back in March I wrote him expressing my dismay about the fact that 300 applications in my community alone are awaiting OHRP funding. In his response, he said Windsor now receives \$10,000 to \$12,000 a month in OHRP repayments, which he just referred to. If he is suggesting that can keep OHRP going, that must be some kind of cruel joke. Two million dollars of OHRP money is needed to get the housing up to standard.

According to the 1981 census data, almost 170,000 dwellings in Ontario are in need of major repair. I would remind him, in spite of cancellation of this program, his government managed to find \$23.2 million last year for advertising in the mass media alone. That was \$4.6 million over 1981-82.

Will the minister now simply admit that the suffocation of OHRP has added to the deterioration of housing in this province, and will he make a commitment to those home owners, and the people who could return to the dignity of employment by repairing these homes, that he will recommend the reintroduction of OHRP in the provincial budget next month?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, I think I have already said very clearly that one can always have the opportunity to review the programs, and indeed we are doing exactly that. It was not meant as a cruel joke, the rollover funding, but

it is there for the municipalities to make available to those who apply for it. I think it would be wrong for this House to believe that because we have withdrawn from the program, at least at this time, the federal government has had its residential rehabilitation assistance program in place and has supplemented it in the last while.

Mr. Cooke: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact there are 750,000 people unemployed in this province and that renovation creates about twice as many jobs per dollar invested as does brand new housing construction, why did the government decide to cancel this very successful program with unemployment running at 12 per cent and 13 per cent across this province?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, in relationship to the program and its cancellation, indeed I think I have already answered that in the original part of my answer to the original question. There are rollover funds. I have not excluded the opportunity of still having some other programs in place.

RE-EMPLOYMENT OF FORMER SKF EMPLOYEES

Mr. R. F. Johnston: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour. The minister will recall that although he said it has only been a few months, it was two and a half years ago that plant rationalization took place around SKF in my riding. It was not a new phenomenon. It has been 17 months since that plant has closed. Is the minister aware that 60 per cent of those workers are still unemployed at this time? What is he doing to make sure those people get employment? What has he done?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, I was aware of a large percentage; I was not aware of the 60 per cent figure and I am not disputing the accuracy of that number. My ministry, through the plant closure and employment adjustment committee, has worked with the employees to try to provide counselling services and retraining programs. I really did feel it was more successful than the numbers that have been quoted today by the honourable member.

Mr. R. F. Johnston: I am quoting from statistics from a study by Paul Grayson on the SKF matter. Is the minister then not aware that of the men who are without work, 73 per cent put the blame on the management of the economy and 62 per cent put the blame on the fact that they are older workers for the situation in which they are not able to get work? Most of them, as the minister knows, are the average age

of 51 now. What plan is the minister urging the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) to adopt in his new budget to make sure older workers like these are not thrown on the scrap heap but are put back into useful work for the remaining 10 to 15 years of their normal working lives?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: I am confident the Treasurer of this province will have a very exciting and stimulating budget that will address the problems of unemployment and job creation in this province.

Mr. Sweeney: Mr. Speaker, SKF is one of the classic examples of probably having closed the wrong plant. That was something that was discovered afterwards. This minister is responsible for that whole area of plant closures and the regulations and the policies that develop about it. Had they been in place at that time, this number of people would not now be out of work. What is he doing at the present time to prevent a recurrence of that and a recurrence of this kind of layoff?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, we cannot do anything retroactively on SKF and the member understands that, but what we have done, and I realize this is going to seem to be very minimal in the light of the seriousness of the problems, is to commission a study on SKF, as the member is aware, as to the impact on all of the workers. We are funding part of that study and we are hoping to be able to benefit from the information that will be provided to us.

EXTENDED CARE BED PROGRAM

Mr. T. P. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Northern Affairs concerning his much-heralded extended care bed program in northern Ontario, the program that was supposed to be announced around Christmas as to which communities would be receiving the beds and when.

2:40 p.m.

When is the minister going to make the announcement of the communities that have been chosen? When can I inform the good people of Atikokan that, because of their hard work and their raising of the money for their portion, they will be able to go ahead with this program?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I am most pleased the honourable member has asked me this question because it gives me the opportunity to expound at great length about what a great program this is.

It was announced in the throne speech, but I

would point out we made no commitment that we would notify the communities by last December. We said an application process would be devised, which has been done. That has gone out to the communities and the interest is absolutely unreal. Right now it is before the review committees of both the Ministry of Health and the Ministry of Northern Affairs, and Management Board of Cabinet. I am hoping to make an announcement in the near future.

Mr. T. P. Reid: The minister is aware he and his officials have said "Christmas," "after Christmas," "February" and "early March." Can he be more definitive as to when this announcement will be made? Can he give us an indication of the ranking of who will be able to go ahead, because Atikokan in particular has pushed this program for many years and has had the money for some time? It is quite anxious to be able to have something in the ground this year, not next year.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I am very much aware of the community's interest. I want to congratulate all the communities that have raised their one-sixth portion of the capital cost, but it is difficult for me to give the member a definitive answer. I suggest if he follow me around northern Ontario, he will hear the announcement for himself in the near future.

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Speaker, given that the minister announced this even before it was contained in the throne speech over a year ago, and given that he has had some excellent presentations, particularly the one from the town of Geraldton, why is it taking so long? Three or four months ago he told me it had been reviewed by his ministry and was now in the hands of the Ministry of Health. Why is it taking the Ministry of Health so long to reach a decision on the excellent programs that have been hanging fire for well over 13 months?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, there is more to this program than just a building per se. It has to tie in to the hospital itself. The electrical system has to be expanded and the heating system has to be expanded in many cases. The kitchen staff has to be broadened. All those administrative items have to be considered in the planning process. That is part of the planning process that is going on now.

UREA FORMALDEHYDE FOAM INSULATION

Mr. Swart: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour and it has a real employ-

ment dimension to it too. It pertains to the application of the Home Owners with Urea Formaldehyde Foam Insulation groups in Simcoe county, Hamilton, Guelph, Kitchener, Windsor and Ottawa, and others, for assistance under the Canada-Ontario employment development program for removal of foam insulation from their homes.

Recognizing the labour intensive nature of the work and the tremendous need for corrective measures in the urea formaldehyde foam insulation homes, why has the government been instrumental in refusing approval of these applications under COED?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure the province has refused. It is my understanding it is the federal government that has refused. The member should bear in mind the COED program is a co-operative program between the federal and the provincial governments. There has to be approval from both sides before a project goes forward.

Mr. Swart: Can the minister not recognize the scepticism of UFFI groups, myself and many others that he has not turned it down? Although Hamilton applied last December, it has not even been approved in principle. The secretariat has not even had any negotiations with them. Mr. Michel Simard, who is the assistant to Mr. Ouellet, says, "We have indications from the Ontario government they will not participate, even though we are encouraging it and would fully participate ourselves."

If the minister has not refused, will he now give a commitment to this House and to the UFFI home owners that the province considers HUFFI groups to be eligible for the COED program and will work for approval of those requests in the joint secretariat?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: I would appreciate it very much if the member would send across to me a copy of the letter he has from Mr. Ouellet. Certainly I will be happy to look at the matter again.

Mr. Wrye: Mr. Speaker, while the minister is taking a look at this, perhaps he could raise with his provincial cabinet colleagues and with his federal colleagues the fact of the danger of continued use of UFFI in homes in the province. For example, there was a home in my riding that recently burned to the ground, and 10 firefighters suffered nausea and a number of other real problems while trying to fight the fire. Would the minister take to his cabinet colleagues the

word that it is very important that we move immediately to remove UFFI from these homes?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, it sounds like a reasonable request and I am prepared to respond to it, but I would question the fact that the injuries to the firefighters were caused by the existence of that substance. That is not my understanding at all.

ONTARIO STOCK YARDS

Mr. Shymko: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address my question to the Minister of Agriculture and Food in the light of the questions raised by the member for York South (Mr. Rae) and the member for Kitchener-Wilmot (Mr. Sweeney), who to some degree misled us in his own comment that the member for High Park-Swansea wanted the relocation of the stockyards.

Mr. Speaker: The question, please.

Mr. Shymko: The question is, in the light of the decision by Canada Packers to relocate its plants, in the light of the Keljair report on the basis of which the ministry decided the present location of the stockyards will remain, and in the light of the fact that the argument given by Canada Packers that the location of the stockyards has absolutely nothing to do with the feasibility of its operation of the present site, is the ministry prepared, first, to join the municipal task force that is apparently being established to study the entire area in a full-scale inquiry into the location of the stockyards and the industry operating in line with that location?

Second, does the ministry intend to make an internal study that would look at the entire location of the stockyards, which apparently has nothing to do with the operation of the meat-packing industry?

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Agriculture and Food will please answer one.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, the member will know I met with his worship the mayor and the two local aldermen several weeks ago following the announcement by Canada Packers, at which time I revealed to them that the ministry had been working on an in-depth analysis of the red meat industry for over a year. I released that analysis this morning and it is now on its way to members of the assembly.

Mr. Bradley: About time.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: About time? Well, they have been there a year.

I also indicated that in my view and in the view of the ministry, the decision by Canada Packers to move its slaughter operations to

Burlington and to Kitchener does not in and of itself mean the stockyards should or would close. I point out that the company has been buying most of its hogs from the yards and anticipates continuing to buy most of its cattle at the yards, even when the slaughter operations have been moved to Burlington. The company it bought out in Burlington has been buying most of its cattle from the Ontario Stock Yards on Keele Street as well.

When I revealed this to the mayor and to the local aldermen, they were pleased to know the ministry was well on top of the situation, as it is in most things. I assured them I would be more than happy to have officials of my ministry assist the task force.

I can certainly understand their concern about maintaining a viable industry in the west end of the city. Mr. Speaker, you will know, since you represent a large number of cattlemen who ship to the Toronto yards, that there is a much bigger industry out there than just that one CP slaughterhouse.

Of course we will work with them. I urged them, in fact, to create the task force to respond to this report, to look at the future of the meat industry and everything related to it—the food industry in the west end of Toronto—in the light of the very interesting results of this report.

2:50 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: Just before you put your supplementary, it has been brought to my attention that you may have inadvertently used some unparliamentary language, and if you did, I would ask you to withdraw it, please.

Mr. Bradley: The word was misled.

Mr. Shymko: I withdraw, if I did.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you.

Mr. Shymko: In the light of the fundamental argument in the Keljair report that the location of the stockyards is fundamental to the operation of an expansion of Canada Packers, since that fundamental argument has been pulled out from under the feet of that report in the decision of the ministry, is there an intention on the part of the ministry once again to review the location of the stockyards and to look at the Board of Industrial Leadership and Development program, which said that there should be a full-scale study and inquiry involving the union, local taxpayers, local industry and the municipality, so that in the future this red herring pulled by Canada Packers will not be used again

and we are not going to be surprised with decisions?

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Sic Duncan Allan on him.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: You know whereof you speak.

I would not want to leave the impression that the ministry is considering moving the stockyards. At this time, given the decision by Canada Packers, given that they will likely continue to buy most of their cattle requirements at the Toronto stockyards, and given that they, in fact, last year handled close to 40 per cent of all the cattle sold in the province, I can see no reason at this time to contemplate a review of the location of the stockyards.

VISITOR

Hon. Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of the House to the fact that in your gallery today is Lorne Maeck, the former Minister of Revenue and former member for Parry Sound.

Mr. Speaker: It is always nice to see a former Minister of Revenue.

Mr. Bradley: The former minister will want to know that the program of grants to seniors has not advanced considerably in terms of its administration since he left, but that is not my question.

NIAGARA RIVER WATER QUALITY

Mr. Bradley: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of the Environment, who is apparently unscarred from his trip to Niagara District Secondary School this morning. The question is related to the drinking water available to municipalities in the Niagara region.

The minister has had under consideration for some time—and many of us at the local level have advocated this measure—a proposal to implement in the Niagara Falls plant the activated carbon filtration system as a pilot project or, as an alternative, another method which has been discussed with officials of his ministry which may be less expensive and as effective as the activated carbon filtration system. Is the minister prepared at this time, after evaluating those two systems, to make a statement as to whether he is prepared to fund a pilot project in Niagara Falls?

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, as I think the honourable member is aware, I have on numerous occasions discussed the viability of an

the rights of francophones in this province in a constitutional way? Given the fact the Premier has alluded to the rights of anglophones in Quebec and wants some reciprocity in that respect, does that mean he is prepared to look afresh at that particular option which he has?

Hon. Mr. Wells: My perception in reading this, although I did not hear the speech today, would be that at this point we are talking about something rather different. We are talking about those things Quebec has said are not in the Constitution which prevents it from accepting it in the way the rest of us hope it would.

As to the idea of discussing full fiscal compensation, the Prime Minister of Canada has suggested perhaps we should talk about a veto. I think we realize it is a little late to go back and talk about vetoes in the Constitution. That, of course, was the constitutional position the government of Canada first put forward, which this province and New Brunswick supported. It was rejected by the other provinces and changed when the constitutional accord came about.

I think in this context the Premier is talking about things such as fiscal compensation and those other things which would make the Constitution of Canada acceptable to, or accepted by the government of Quebec. It should also be underlined that the Constitution of Canada does apply and the people of Quebec enjoy all the privileges and responsibilities that go with the new Constitution.

ANNUAL REPORTS

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: I draw your attention to standing order 33(a) which requires that, "ministers shall present all reports required by statute within six months of the close of the reporting period unless reasons for delay are given to the House."

The annual report of the registrar of loan and trust corporations for the year 1979 was tabled nine months late on April 21, 1981, and we have not as yet received or had tabled in the House the annual reports of the registrar for the years 1980 and 1981.

Mr. Speaker: I am sure the minister responsible will take action as requested.

3:10 p.m.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

EMPLOYMENT STANDARDS AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Wrye moved, seconded by Mr. Ruston,

first reading of Bill 19, An Act to amend the Employment Standards Act.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Wrye: Mr. Speaker, this bill would amend the group termination scheme of the act to provide the severance pay as due when the employment of 15 rather than 50 employees is terminated during a six-month period. It is payable to employees with one year's rather than five years' seniority and is not subject to a maximum, rather than being limited to the equivalent of 26 weeks' wages.

YONGE-ROSEDALE CHARITABLE FOUNDATION ACT

Mrs. Scrivener moved, seconded by Mr. J. A. Taylor, first reading of Bill Pr14, An Act respecting the Yonge-Rosedale Charitable Foundation.

Motion agreed to.

CITY OF TORONTO ACT

Ms. Fish moved, seconded by Mr. Robinson, first reading of Bill Pr3, An Act respecting the City of Toronto.

Motion agreed to.

THOMAS-HAMILTON-WEBBER LTD. ACT

Mr. Van Horne moved, seconded by Mr. Sweeney, first reading of Bill Pr11, An Act to revive Thomas-Hamilton-Webber Ltd.

Motion agreed to.

LEMON-AID ACT

Mr. Philip moved, seconded by Mr. Swart, first reading of Bill 20, An Act to protect the Purchasers of New Motor Vehicles.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Philip: Mr. Speaker, this bill, which will come to be known as the Lemon-Aid Act, 1983, will entitle the consumer who owns a defective new motor vehicle to obtain either an equivalent vehicle in replacement or a full refund of the purchase price.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE (continued)

Resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to be able to reply to the speech

from the throne. Last year I did not have a seat in this Legislature and so was not able to respond in the House.

Interjections.

Mr. Rae: You had your chance and you blew it.

I very much appreciate this opportunity. I notice the Premier (Mr. Davis) is here and I appreciate his being here. I just want to tell him I am going to be talking exclusively about provincial issues, so if he decides to leave early and loses interest in what I am saying I will understand.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I just sent you a note saying I was leaving, but not because of that.

Mr. Rae: I intend to speak this afternoon principally on three issues that I believe are of deep and profound concern to the people of this province. I intend to speak this afternoon about jobs, about the lack of them in this province, and about the human impact on our people that this extended joblessness has had and is having and will continue to have unless we give recovery the human face it deserves.

I also intend to speak about housing, because I believe where there is a population having increasing difficulties making ends meet, one which is more poorly housed this year than it was five years ago in terms of cost, availability and access, this is an issue that will not go away and no amount of rhetoric in the speech from the throne will make it go away.

Finally, I intend to speak principally this afternoon about our health care system and particularly about what has happened to the nursing home industry in this province and on the fate of a great many senior citizens whom I believe deserve better from the government than they have been receiving and who certainly deserve better when it comes to institutional care.

This is not an issue that simply affects senior citizens. It is an issue that affects each and every one of us, because old age is not a disease, it is a condition of life itself. It is also an unquestionable fact, and I say this to the Premier in all sincerity, that there is now a conflict going on in Ontario between those of us who believe in a universal medicare program, those of us who believe that medicare is designed to provide care for people regardless of means from birth until death, and the world of private profit, the world of private enrichment, the world of cutbacks and of profiteering that has no place

whatsoever in a health care system worthy of the name.

When I say I am focusing on the nursing home industry, I am focusing on what is happening to a great many people who are in nursing homes today. The issue is far broader than simply that. The issue is whether we are going to have a public medicare system worthy of the name, or whether we are going to allow those profits of private enterprise and private enrichment to encroach and entrench their position in the health care system to a point where it becomes unrecognizable as a universally accessible system.

An article came across my desk the other day from the Canadian Medical Association Journal. Under the heading of Economics, it is called "The Ontario Hospital Experiment: American Managers March In." It is by a regular contributor to the CMA Journal named Milan Korcok, who appropriately lives in Fort Lauderdale, Florida. Mr. Korcok describes the decision by the Ministry of Health to allow a company called AMI, an American private hospital management company, to take over the management of the Hawkesbury and District General Hospital.

3:20 p.m.

This might seem to be a very minor matter were it not for the fact that I believe it represents a fundamental change. Indeed, the CMA agrees with the fact that it represents a fundamental change.

I quote from the final page of Mr. Korcok's article, where he says, "The willingness of the Ontario government to bless the Hawkesbury contract surely looks like a green light for the re-entry of a private sector that has been effectively locked out of health care insurance."

It goes on to quote Mr. Reid, the gentleman in the Ministry of Health who is responsible for the business-oriented new development program, as saying this about the contract between the hospital in Hawkesbury and AMI: "We don't impose these contracts. (But) if a hospital came to me tomorrow and suggested they would like to go the Hawkesbury route, then we would investigate it and, quite frankly, I would be supportive of it. Right now, what we are looking for is another (hospital) volunteer."

They then go on to quote the gentleman who used to be an employee of the Ministry of Health. If I may say so, this is a pattern we can see repeated throughout what is now unfortunately called the health care industry. A former employee of the Ministry of Health says

they are looking for expansion and they are delighted with the challenge.

Another official of AMI, Mr. Silvin, says Ontario is the new target area for AMI. "We are focusing on Ontario for our achievement list. We would love to take on a teaching hospital that's our goal."

I think we can see what has happened in Hawkesbury is simply the thin edge of the wedge.

Nowhere is the conflict between the demands for public health, the right of people to a decent living environment regardless of their economic circumstances, the conflict between that sense and that vision and the very different reality more clear than in the tragic situation facing so many senior citizens, particularly those who are unable to speak or care for themselves in many instances. They find themselves with very few choices in life.

When we consider what happens to many seniors we realize that as a society we are getting older and a great many seniors are faced with not wanting to leave their homes even though the government does not provide them with adequate home care services. They suddenly become very ill. When faced with a very sudden illness, they and their families have to make some very difficult choices. I want to suggest that the choices they are presented with in our society are totally unsatisfactory. A great many people face tremendous hardship because of the choices that are imposed on them.

There are at the moment 340 nursing homes in Ontario, virtually all of them organized on a private profit basis. Some of them are run on a multinational basis as part of multinational chains. They have 28,686 beds. They are run on a private profit basis. They are inspected by an inspection staff from the Ministry of Health which consists of three fire inspectors for 340 nursing homes in Ontario, three environmental health inspectors for 340 nursing homes, 14 nursing inspectors for 340 nursing homes, and three regional supervisors for a grand total of 24.

On April 11, 1983, Mr. Paul Gould, who has just recently been named the manager of nursing home services in the Ministry of Health, gave a public presentation to the Concerned Friends of Ontario Citizens in Care Facilities group, which I will be returning to in a moment. Mr. Gould had these comments to make, among others. I am quoting from what he said. Like the Minister of Health (Mr. Grossman) we too take notes at some of these meetings.

He said: "With 340 homes it is not an easy or quick end product we are trying to achieve. The solutions are not as easy as they appear to be." He then went on to say: "Our staff are being run off their feet. A lot of pressure is on. We would like to see the best quality care on a restricted budget, given the restraint program the government is on." In a sense that sets the stage for what I am about to describe.

As leader of our party and as someone who has, because of personal circumstances, taken an interest in the nursing home industry and in the choices facing seniors, like many others I have received many letters. I would like to read letters I have received from three very different people about very different circumstances.

I believe these letters, together with the rest of the evidence which I want to introduce this afternoon, indicate there is something very gravely and seriously wrong with the way in which our nursing home industry is run, organized and managed. Perhaps even more fundamental than that, there is something very wrong in the government's attitude to senior citizens and to the role and place of private enterprise in the health care field.

The first letter I would like to read comes to me from a Mrs. Gwenyth Grube. George Grube, who died last year, was one of the founders of our party and a candidate for us in many elections. For many years he was president of the Ontario Co-operative Commonwealth Federation. He was a professor of classics at Trinity College of the University of Toronto and a jewel of an individual.

He was a friend to me in his later years. I am fortunate and indeed proud to have his personal copy of the book *Social Planning for Canada* which he was involved in writing and which, as members know, was one of the principal critiques of the Canadian economy produced in the 1930s.

One can imagine how upsetting it was for me to receive last year this letter from Mrs. Grube with respect to care her husband was receiving at a nursing home in this province.

I intend to name these nursing homes, because I do not think we can go on any longer pretending that everything is okay in these industries. I do not think we can go along any longer saying that all is well and that anything is served by not naming names, giving examples and being very specific. I would not pull my punches in this respect any more than we should with respect to a hospital, and it is important for us to remember that.

This is a copy of a letter that Mrs. Grube wrote to the Ministry of Health nursing home division:

"Dear Sir or Madam:

"I am writing to complain of conditions at Barton Place Nursing Home, 914 Bathurst Street. My husband, George Grube, was moved there on January 13, 1982, from Central Hospital where he had received very satisfactory care. He was a bed and wheelchair patient and after a fall was put into loose restraint. He did not grumble about this or even mention it to me on my daily visits.

"At Barton Place, although he was clearly very weak, he was not given a restraint but a small movable table was put in front of him. He could push it away with one hand. He fell on Saturday, February 6, and was taken to Toronto Western Hospital to have a head cut stitched up. On February 9 he fell again, broke his hip and sustained other head injuries. He is 82.

"Knowing how professionals hate advice from nonprofessionals I unfortunately postponed suggesting a restraint until it was too late. Several friends who visited my husband, one with nursing experience, say they too were anxious on his behalf but like me hesitated to interfere. My daughter from New York went to collect his clothes from Barton Place and to find out how the accident happened. She was foiled in her attempt.

"A great deal of pain and suffering has ensued and perhaps worse is to come. Even from a tax point of view, hospital care is, of course, very much more expensive than nursing home care. I could say a lot more about conditions at Barton Place, but for the moment will confine myself to the insecurity of patients."

She sent me a copy of that letter. We wrote back and forth and she wrote me finally on May 15, 1982, to say:

"Many thanks for your letter. I have received three letters from Mr. Klammer." Mr. Klammer was at that time the chief of the nursing home inspection service.

"February 26; acknowledged my letter and promised investigation. March 10; a disingenuous befuddlement in much the same words as the repeat on May 10. (We have got under their skin.) I can't tell whether Mr. Klammer is stupid or just hopes that we are."

3:30 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Grube is a lady, you will know, who speaks her mind in no uncertain terms.

A few points: "They learned nothing and did

nothing after George's fall on February 6 to avoid a repeat on February 9. The doctor evidently was not consulted, nor was I. When endeavouring to get a refund on the money that I had prepaid, I was told George's doctor was away for two weeks and no other doctor could sign a cheque for me. I finally got the refund by frequent phoning.

"Shouldn't we insist on higher standards, then?" she goes on to say. "A comfortable lounge on each floor, for instance. On George's floor a sunroom not big enough for all the patients, served also as dining room and TV room. Many patients had to sit in their wheelchairs in the corridor staring at the opposite wall. Regarding taking the matter further, as you suggest, only will-power is keeping George alive. He is very ill. Perhaps we should wait a while?"

As I said, Mr. Speaker, George Grube has since passed away.

I think it was receiving this letter, as I did very soon after I became leader of our party and very soon after some personal experiences that caused me as a son and grandson to look into the question of nursing homes, that caused me to ask some questions about what was going on. We made some inquiries and had some discussions with a number of groups, including the Concerned Friends group.

Before I get to some of the things we have discovered in the last number of months, I want to quote a couple more letters because I think it is important that we get the evidence into the record as to what average, ordinary people are experiencing—not people who have any kind of axe to grind, not people who are trying to make a political point, but people who are simply sending letters, frequently just sending copies to us so we will be aware of what their concerns are.

I have another letter here from an individual who has asked to remain anonymous but who is a constituent of mine. She again sent me a copy of a letter she wrote to the Minister of Health. This letter is dated November 3, 1982, and in it she describes two experiences she has had with respect to two nursing homes for her mother.

It may take a little time, but I think it is important that these letters get into the record and that we see what is going on in incident after incident so that no one can get up and say, "You are just talking about a number of isolated incidents." There is a pattern here, and it is a pattern that has to be dealt with, that has to be remedied. The pattern, I believe, speaks to the

way in which health care is treated by this government and to the way in which this government has allowed the forces of private profit to have a virtual monopoly in the care for senior citizens in nursing homes.

"On the morning of October 14, 1982," my constituent writes, "my father and my sister admitted my mother into a nursing home in Toronto." I have since ascertained from this constituent that she is speaking of the Lincoln Place Nursing Home in Toronto.

"My sister talked with the administrator at length about pills mother was to take, a total of four a day. The following is a report of what took place in the next five days.

"Wednesday, October 15, my brother visited her at lunch time, and she seemed a little confused but settled. She was, however, not wearing her own clothes.

"Thursday, October 16, no one visited.

"Friday, October 17, my husband and I visited, and we couldn't believe how she looked. She was to have had her hair washed and set by the hairdresser. It had been washed but obviously not set. She was wearing someone else's dress that was too big, and she had no bra on. I asked her if she was taking all her pills, and she replied, 'I haven't had any pills yet.' She had two bruises on her arm.

"I spoke to the woman at the front station about the bruises and the pills. She looked through mother's records, etc., and said there was no record of any medication given, even though all this had been discussed on the day she was admitted. She was to have been given one high-blood-pressure pill and three a day of another drug prescribed by her doctor in treatment of possible Alzheimer's disease.

"Saturday, October 18, my father and my sister visited, and again she did not have her own clothes on. Not only that, they had not even unpacked her suitcase. My father and sister were very upset at how she looked, and my father wanted to take her home that very day. My sister phoned me from the nursing home, and we decided to leave her there one more night and discuss it further with the family.

"Sunday, October 19, my father's decision was to get her out of that place because she was not being looked after properly. My sister called down to say we'd be picking her up after supper. When we got there about 6:30 p.m., she had no undergarments on, she was wearing an old pair of slacks that were too big and a brown sweater coat (also not her own) with one button done up. Her hair had not even been combed. What a

sad, heartbreaking sight to see your mother like that. We dressed her and took her home. My father is 82 years old and my mother is 72."

"This is the second experience with nursing homes. In July she was admitted to one." Again, I have ascertained that this is the Town and Country Nursing Homes in Thornhill. "The administrator there told us not to visit her for seven to 10 days so she could get used to being there. My brother visited after five days and did not like what he saw. We visited after a week and she looked terrible. They kept them drugged. She did not even have her teeth in. Can you imagine anyone not noticing she did not have her teeth and trying to eat her supper? I demanded that they find her teeth immediately, because we had taken her a couple of home-made cookies. They found the teeth and were trying to shove them in her mouth until I noticed that they were not even her own teeth. The woman that shared the bedroom had her teeth in her mouth. It was revolting, to say the least.

"I told my dad this and the next day we went to pick her up and dad did not even recognize her. He walked right by her to the desk. In this place they kept them in a type of high chair for hours on end and they could not get out. My mother is living at home again now and my father is doing his best to look after her. Doesn't anyone care what happens in nursing homes? Most of these nursing homes are government subsidized. Do the people who run these nursing homes really care about their patients? Are there any answers?"

I have been in touch on many occasions with the lady who wrote this letter and now can confirm that this lady's mother did go home, that she subsequently broke her hip while at home on March 11, and that she is now in the Etobicoke General Hospital.

A third letter I have is from an individual living in Orillia. Again, he has asked to remain anonymous, and I will be saying a word about why people want their names to be kept anonymous. That, in itself, is an indication of what is wrong with the nursing home industry in this province. He again has copies of letters he sent to the Minister of Health and the replies the minister has sent to him.

I simply want to indicate to you, Mr. Speaker, what his concerns are and give you a sense of the difficulties facing a great many families and the difficulties facing a great many people who I think deserve better in their old age than they are receiving from this government, and cer-

tainly better than they are receiving from some of the people in the industry.

This letter is dated January 2, 1983.

"Dear Sir:

"I was in Blenheim, Ontario, between Christmas and New Year's to visit my father who is in the Canadianna nursing home in Chatham, Ontario.

"It was very upsetting to notice that 90 per cent of the residents on his floor were mentally retarded. There is no one who has more feeling for them than myself, but I do feel they should be by themselves.

"Is this how the government of the day is able to close many of the mental hospitals in Ontario, at the expense of senior citizens? The staff at the nursing home were fine, but the atmosphere was not conducive to improving the health of those who were in there with physical problems only. The weeping, wailing and staring eyes were getting to me the few hours I was there. It is not very nice when you still have your mental faculties to spend your last days in this type of environment."

He goes on to talk about the cost and how expensive it was, and then he says: "Since the Canadianna nursing home still did not have a semi-private or ward room available, the family made the decision to move him to Guilds Nursing Home, which is three miles southeast of Blenheim. This is costing \$15 a day but no extended health care. The doctor was not too happy about the move but this is all my parents can afford. However, my father is much happier in Guilds and gets tender loving care from all the staff which will probably do more for his condition than anything. Speaking to my mother by phone today my father is resting better now and able to go by wheelchair to the dining area for his meals."

In the further correspondence that takes place it turns out this gentleman's father is not, in fact, in a nursing home at all. He is now in a rest home. I think it is worth reading a letter this gentleman got from the minister, dated March 22:

"Further to my letter, my staff have looked into the concerns you raised regarding the nursing home in Chatham. Nursing homes in Ontario are available to all the residents of this province who are in need of nursing care as determined by their attending physicians and according to the criteria established under the extended health care program. In a home the size of Canadianna, there will inevitably be residents who have many different disabilities

which may be of physical or mental origin. Nevertheless, they all require those nursing services which are provided in the nursing home.

"The facility in Guilds where your father is now a resident is not a licensed nursing home, but a rest home." In other words, it is an entirely unlicensed private operation. "This is the reason there are no extended health care benefits."

3:40 p.m.

Those three letters, plus of course the evidence which my colleague the member for Bellwoods (Mr. McClellan) introduced before the standing committee on social development, which was considering the estimates of the Ministry of Health, the documentation which he so graphically and movingly gave with respect to the circumstances of the Ark Eden home, indicated to me very clearly that there was something profoundly wrong and more work needed to be done. We needed to know more. We needed to find out exactly how this kind of situation could have developed in Ontario.

I might add, when one gets a very positive letter from the minister, or a letter from Mr. Klamer or somebody in the ministry staff, it is perhaps worth remembering. It is perhaps worth my quoting once again the letter that Mr. Klamer wrote on August 11, 1981, with respect to the Ark Eden Nursing Home. I think it is important to put on the record exactly what this government was doing when it was faced with the tragic situation at that home, which has now been admitted to by the Minister of Health.

"The nurse inspector has completed her investigation into your concerns identified in your memo dated July 27, 1981. The nurse inspector interviewed staff members and perused the staff time schedule which the payroll was taken from. It is reflected that adequate staff has been provided to ensure that no nursing unit is left unattended. The staff assured the inspector there was at least one person in the nursing unit at all times.

"The nurse inspector did an inspection of the personal care programs and outcomes and concluded that the essential components in care fundamentals of the nursing program are intact, well established and maintained."

It goes on to give the same kind of whitewash to the situation at the Ark Eden home, a whitewash which flies in the face of the fact that at the very time this gentleman was writing this particular letter, the nursing home in question was in violation of several items in the regulations in the Nursing Homes Act.

We then have the brief of the Concerned Friends of Ontario Citizens in Care Facilities, the relatives of people in institutions in this province. This is an organization which has done a tremendous amount to get this issue into the open and to give courage and confidence to residents and to friends and relatives of residents who are caught in this labyrinth of secrecy, this labyrinth of free enterprise, and in decisions taken which prevent them from being able to provide adequate care for their families.

They say, for example: "Within the membership of this organization we have now documented situations involving neglect through confidential feedback from relatives who visit homes frequently."

The same concerns surface again and again: Poor nutrition; lack of cleanliness; poorly trained staff; staff unwilling to relate to residents or relatives; people left sitting on bedpans for long periods; over-medication of residents; mysterious injuries, unexplained bruises; injuries left untreated; bedsores. There is the lack of any kind of stimulation, which in turn leads to more institutionalized behaviour; no resident or relative input whatsoever in the development of care plans, medical treatment and/or assessments without consent; misuse of form 1 as a means of moving residents into psychiatric facilities; inappropriate moves and transfers to other facilities without consent; total loss of privacy and dignity; inadequate personal care and hygiene. And it goes on and on.

In addition, we have another body of evidence which has never really been drawn on and never really seen the light of day. That is the evidence which has come forward from a number of employees' organizations in making their arbitration submissions.

One of the great themes that can be seen to be running through the concerns that are expressed by friends and relatives, and by parents and the concerns that are expressed by staff, is the inadequacy of staff, the fact there is not enough staff to do the job that needs to be done.

When one hears this from relatives, it frequently comes out as a complaint about the staff, because what they are saying is there is not enough being done. "They had to go up to another floor" or whatever; or, "They were very short, they did not have time to talk to my mother," or father or brother or sister. But if one asks the staff these questions, they will say: "Of course that is a problem. It is a problem because there is simply not enough time in the day to do the kind of job that needs to be done."

Again, there are very graphic statements that are made by individuals in these institutions who are working hard in a very difficult job. I would like to read a description written by members of a Canadian Union of Public Employees' local in reply to an arbitration grievance with respect to an arbitration at the River Glen Haven Nursing Home:

"As we indicated earlier, this home has 90 residents of whom approximately 35 per cent have psychiatric problems. Another 15 per cent are alcoholics and suffer from alcoholic-related diseases and must be kept on controlled drugs. A good number suffer varying degrees of senility, have physical problems related to strokes, multiple sclerosis, etc., while others have behavioural problems. Some display violent behaviour. The majority are classified as heavy-care patients, those who require a lot of assistance, such as lifting in and out of bed, assistance with toileting, bathing, washing, etc.

"With few exceptions, the vast majority of patients need total nursing care, have little or no control of their body functions, need assistance with their food and all need supervision."

That is the point that has to be made again and again. The picture that many try to portray of a nursing home is increasingly out of the reality of what a nursing home does. It is not a kind of rest home where people are gladly walking around with an endless amount to do, endless activities going on. That is not the reality. In many instances, particularly on some floors of nursing homes, the reality is they have become chronic care hospitals.

The whole division which has been made by the Ministry of Health and the Ministry of Community and Social Services between those who have extended-care needs and those who do not have extended-care needs, and those who should be in a hospital—the whole division between rest homes and homes for the aged and nursing homes and chronic care hospitals bears no relationship to the reality of what is really going on in these places.

I would like to describe what this union has to say about some of the practices that have taken place in this particular place. "The following is a partial list of complaints brought to the union's attention by various employees of the home that indicate the degree of difficulty encountered in attempting to properly carry out their duties and responsibilities.

"1. The thermostats have been preset and locked in the patients' dining room. Temperatures have been recorded as low as 52 degrees at

breakfast time and 63 degrees at lunch time in the winter months.

"2. Numerous shifts have started without sufficient linen supplies. Employees resort to using one end of the towel for washing and the other end for drying patients. On occasion employees have had to use rags. Because of the shortage, some patients were not given their baths or showers. Often there was not sufficient bed linen.

"3. Sterile gloves and gowns for handling patients with open sores, shingles, etc., are often not available.

"4. The supply of sterile dressings often runs out so that staff is forced to use incontinent pads.

"5. Employees complain that hot water tanks are set too low with the result patients often have to be bathed in cold water. Laundry staff complains that water is not hot enough to properly clean bed clothes.

"6. Laundry staff no longer supplied with bleach or fabric softener resulting in stained and dirty looking sheets and linens and the clothes are full of static.

"7. Kitchen staff reported that employers changed meat companies and meat is now of very poor quality. Grocery company has been changed also and now they get rusted cans and cans with dents in them. The kitchen is still short of pots and pans. Some pans have holes in them. There are no SOS pads, etc. There are just enough bowls for each patient's use." This sounds like something out of Charles Dickens. "If any bowls are broken, some patients will not get cereal or soup. The employer will not purchase any more bowls or cups. Cups are also in short supply.

"Kitchen staff also reports that the stove in the kitchen does not work properly. One oven has a broken door which is always open an inch or so. As a result the broiler is always coming on. All food put in this oven burns. The second oven does not heat up properly and it takes nearly five hours to cook a meatloaf. The employer refuses to repair or replace these stoves.

"8. The cleaning staff has been told they will not receive any more disinfectant or brushes to scrub the toilets. They have to use warm water and dish soap and their bare hands to clean the toilets. Many cleaning materials such as Saniflush, toilet bowl brushes, rubber gloves are not being supplied.

"9. The alarm buzzer for the main entrance is often turned off and the patients often leave the building unnoticed. Patients have been found

outside of the building. This especially happens when the home is operating short-staffed. Patients have often been found wandering outside in the snow without warm clothing and wearing only slippers on their feet.

3:50 p.m.

"We have pointed out only some of the more serious problems, as many, many more have been reported. The most frequent problem brought to our attention is the number of times the home has operated short-staffed because the employer fails to replace staff who are ill, on vacation, on leave of absence, etc.

"In one four-month period, between February and May of this year, 81 different shifts operated without a full complement of staff." That is 81 shifts without a full complement of staff. "This results in the patients not receiving the proper care they need and deserve, and employees being overworked." The union goes on to say, "It is our opinion that these conditions exist in order that the employer can maximize his profits."

Similarly, I would like to quote from a brief that was made with respect to the Tender Loving Care Nursing Home and give the House a sense of what it means to work in these places, and the kind of work that is involved.

"Patients are bathed (often several times a day as many have no control of their bodily functions), given mouth care, foot care, nail care and other personal attention and treatment. Aides are responsible for keeping the patients' rooms tidy by cleaning the closets, dressers, drawers, chairs, wheelchairs, etc. When a patient dies, the nurse's aide is responsible for preparing the body for the coroner, which could involve washing the patient, combing and dressing the body. There is no morgue at this home so bodies are left in their rooms until the coroner arrives. It is not unusual that this takes a day or more.

"This is just a brief outline of some of the general duties involved in patient care. We outline them here, not only for the board's information, but also to explain some of the difficulties that employees have expressed that they encounter in the carrying out of their duties."

In other words, the frustration that is felt is a frustration that is felt by the employees themselves, just as much as it is felt by many of the parents and relatives of some residents.

"We have been told by employees that the shampoo supplied to them is so thin it won't make suds when they attempt to wash the

patients' hair. The mouth wash has been diluted, and they are not allowed to use the hair conditioner.

"We have been told that the linen is so disgraceful they would not let a dog lie in it, face cloths are so thin aides get excrement over themselves when they wash patients who have soiled themselves. Towels are so worn and thin that pieces stick to patients' bodies when they are being dried. There is always a shortage of linen and employees resort to hiding it so they will have enough for their particular patients' needs."

They then go on to describe several problems they experience with patient violence. That is particularly true in those nursing homes which are caring for people who are either ex-psychiatric patients or who suffer from severe problems of mental retardation who are now being cared for in nursing homes in Ontario.

I quoted from the letter from the gentleman from Chatham, and I think it is important we make this point. We are not denying the minister's statement that a nursing home has an obligation to care for people whatever the reason for their being there, but we want to ask members of the government to consider what the impact would be on them personally if they were, in a sense, in a situation where they were spending their days, entirely rational, on a ward where the majority of people were suffering from severe emotional or retardational problems.

This is a quote from a book by Clifford Bennett called *Nursing Home Life: What It Is and What It Could Be*. Mr. Bennett himself has been a resident for some time in a nursing home.

He said: "While a patient, I was very conscious of the plight of the rational patients. They were a lost group, obviously living in an environment which was unsuited to their needs. Many were in wheelchairs, some used walking aids, others had severely crippling disabilities, but they were mentally alert and it did not seem right that they should have to spend most of their time among those who had mental afflictions and were illogical and disturbing. Some were even assigned to rooms where confused and disoriented patients also lived. It made no difference whether they were in their rooms, in the corridor or seated in the lounge, there was no escape from the abnormal and depressing behaviour of the irrational patients.

"The current effort on the part of mental institutions," Mr. Bennett goes on to write, "to place many mentally disturbed patients in nursing homes is having a very depressing effect on

alert residents. Their living conditions are being adversely affected, and their anxieties are increasing. This is happening even though many of the nursing home staff members are not trained to cope with patients who have serious mental illnesses."

It was as a result of our pulling together this evidence and of the concerns that were expressed to us by many individuals that we decided in our caucus last term, as it were, that we would do some work of our own and try and discover on a firsthand, first-sight basis what is really going on.

I want to make it very clear that I am not suggesting for a moment that every nursing home in this province is some kind of hell hole. I have visited a great many myself and I have seen very good ones and very bad ones.

It is extremely important that we put this matter in perspective and have a sense that it is a question of a pattern being repeated over and over again, a pattern that cannot simply be said to be a series of unfortunate mistakes, a pattern that cannot simply be responded to by the minister saying, as he does—and he is a great hustler, this minister; he is Johnny on the spot or Larry on the spot; he is always there with a ready answer and he is always ready to say: "Do not worry. We closed down that home yesterday; that is not a problem any more." "Do not worry. We are on top of that situation; we have been in there." And, "Do not worry, it is happening here, there and everywhere else."

That is not the point. The point is that there is a pattern taking place here, a pattern that is endemic, a pattern that has to be changed fundamentally. The only way it can be changed, in my opinion—I reiterate this point because it has to be made again—is if we stop giving private enterprise a monopoly in the nursing home industry in Ontario.

It is absolutely monstrous that in 1983 we should be giving senior citizens and their families and retarded people and their families and young people hit by strokes such an appalling set of choices with respect to institutional care. It is a disgrace that in 1983 we should have to bring up these kinds of situations time and time and time again and simply have the minister or others respond by saying, "Oh well, we believe in a mixed health care system and we believe that private enterprise has a role to play."

That kind of apology will not wash any more. It is not going to work any more because we have the goods now, and the minister cannot

simply come in here and say, "We are on top of it," because they are not on top of it.

What is wrong is the way in which the industry is organized. What is wrong is the attitude, the policy and the positions that have been taken by the Tory government in Ontario. What is wrong is that the Tory government has decided that it wants private enterprise to have its place in the sun when it comes to health care.

We know precisely what that means, and the evidence that is growing in the nursing home industry can be applied to each and every hospital where private enterprise gets its tentacles back in again. You will have the same problems of inadequate staff; you will have the same problems of cutting back; you will have the same problems of people watering down the shampoo, diluting the mouthwash and attempting to get around because they hear a day before that the inspectors are coming in. It will be that same kind of private enterprise philosophy and that mania for private enrichment, which has absolutely no place in the health care system in Ontario.

But the industry cannot be blamed for seeking to make a profit. That is what they are there for; that is what they are all about. The guilty parties are across the floor, because they are the people who have let this situation grow untended. They are the people who have three fire inspectors and 14 nursing inspectors for 340 homes. They are the people who expect us to take that seriously as a policy.

They have a policy under the Nursing Homes Act which requires a minimum of one and a half hours of nursing and personal care each day for extended care residents.

4 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, you and I both know perfectly well that what happens in a situation like that is that one and a half hours does not become the minimum; one and a half hours becomes the maximum. That ratio is the ratio which determines how many staff you hire. That number of hours and that way of looking at it, that way of looking at the problem, is what is partially responsible for the ridiculous situation with respect to inadequate staffing.

We accepted invitations to a number of nursing homes across the province. We accepted invitations at the request of parents; at the request of children; at the request, in some instances, of residents themselves. We did so, wanting to give as fair a sense of what is going on as we possibly could, and wanting, at the same

time, to bring the light of day into these institutions.

One of the problems with institutional care, in general, is that institutions are a way of blocking people out; they are a way of segregating people. That is why we have been so supportive of the principle, and have argued for it throughout this entire decade, that wherever possible we should be caring for people in the community, and that as a general rule people, regardless of their background, regardless of their abilities or disabilities, regardless of whatever problems they may have, have the right to be cared for and live in the community as much as possible.

We have not moved away from that principle, even in those situations where neighbourhoods can be critical of the possibility of a group home. We have resisted the call of those who would say—as I know some members of the Liberal Party have said—that when people are resisting group homes, one has to give in to that pressure and leave people in the institutions; that it is better to give in to that pressure and leave everybody in an institution. We have resisted that trend which the Liberal Party has spoken to, and we are continuing our basic call and our basic feeling that people have to be cared for in the community as much as possible.

But as long as we have institutions, it is important that they be open to the public; that they be open to the light of day, to the fresh air of publicity, to the fresh air of people coming in and out, to the fresh air of doctors being able to come in—the doctors of one's choice being able to come in—to the fresh air of families being able at all times to come in and visit; and if I may say so, that they be open to the fresh air of being able to raise one's voice in complaint and not have to be worried that as a result of that complaint there would be reprisals taken, or steps taken, or threats made, or services cut off, or a change in attitude on the part of those who were administering the care.

There are a great many stories I know that I am going to have to tell the minister in a letter, which will have to be marked "confidential," because I cannot make them public, not because I do not think they should be made public, but for the simple reason that in making them public, I know perfectly well the possible risks—the ridiculous, absurd risks in 1983—that someone who makes those kinds of complaints might experience.

But we did find a pattern of inadequate staffing, persistent problems of fire hazards, problems with the enforcement of existing stan-

dards, and a basic problem: the lack of activity or a lack of stimulation of the residents. I want to go through each of these problems and give members—as much as I can, given the requirements of confidentiality and given the fact that I do not want to identify some of the people who have complained—a sense of what is being experienced.

Regarding Lincoln Place Nursing Home, the one I mentioned earlier, about which a constituent of mine wrote to me: Complaints by residents of incomplete showers; poor scalp care; confirmed by staff member that there is insufficient time to bathe residents properly; sixth floor—heavy care—staff rushing patients to chew, in some cases feeding residents far too quickly.

Several residents complained about having to wear a helmet to the washroom in case they fell because there was insufficient staff to take them as often as needed. This is very reminiscent of the attitude to workers in many plants. Instead of dealing with the problem, instead of providing for the appropriate level of care for those people, they make them wear helmets and then when they fall down they will not bash their heads. Thereby they think that somehow they have solved a great social problem.

There is a case of an individual calling for a nurse for 45 minutes in order to assist this individual to lie down, since that individual had had an operation recently. The observer we had in the home says, "The friend I was with went and brought the nurse back from the fourth floor." Calling for 45 minutes!

The White Eagle Nursing Home: Evidence is that some residents stay wet, if incontinent, if no family is there to help change them. This is all based on onsite eye-to-eye observation—and ear-to-ear in terms of listening—spending on an average two or three, sometimes four hours in a home to get a sense of what is going on, talking not only to the patients but to the staff as well and getting as much of a sense of what is actually happening as possible.

There are complaints of falls occurring and staff having to go to another floor to get assistance to pick up the residents. Again, there is the problem of inadequate staffing. "The staff are very rushed. I thought they did not have very much time to be gentle with patients." That is an account given by one of our staff who was in there. "There is inadequate staff to bathe incontinent residents thoroughly. In one case, I spoke to a woman," as our staff member says, "who must come in and bathe her mother once a week

with a staff person or it will not be done." Once a week, or it will not be done!

Tyndall Nursing Home in Toronto: The staff rushed to get each job done; little attention was able to be paid to the residents. Friends or family often have to clean up the excrement themselves. One resident complained, and her family member as well, that a half bath using only a face cloth is given once a week. She needs more frequent bathing, but there is no staff time. She is not incontinent, but requires wheelchair assistance to the washroom and the staff often do not come in time. The Concerned Friends have complained about this case to the ministry but there has been no resolution yet.

The Heritage Nursing Home: Very few staff is visible on the second floor. For example, there was no staff person to turn on the TV in the lounge, yet a sign prohibited residents from doing so. "After I watched a room full of residents wait for 20 minutes for a staff person to turn on the television, I turned it on."

Call buzzers rang constantly for long periods of time before they were able to be answered. The afternoon shift is so short-staffed that the residents are all brought downstairs at 4:15 p.m. and must sit for an hour while the staff helps prepare food in the kitchen. This was confirmed by the staff. There are few staff, therefore they start putting residents to bed at 6 p.m. in order to get it all done. That is also confirmed by the staff.

Can members imagine how any of us would feel if we were in an institutional setting where they said, "I am sorry, it is not convenient, you have to go to bed at six o'clock, because that is the only time we have got staff available in order to put you into bed."

Barton Place again, the institution mentioned by Mrs. Grube and I know mentioned on the CITY-TV program as well: Inadequate staff to accomplish all the assigned tasks.

On the seventh floor there are 34 heavy care patients, three aides and one registered nurse. On the sixth floor there are 44 heavy care patients, four aides and one RN. On the third floor there are 44 patients, some ambulatory, one and a half aides, one registered nursing assistant, no RN. These workers must get patients up, feed them—in many cases needing a great deal of assistance—wash and dress them, help them with hygiene needs, do minor cleaning and change incontinent residents, etc.

Both staff and patients complained to me that the staff are rushed. They often have to clean patients improperly or shove food in their

mouths. They have no time to visit. On the seventh floor several residents were sitting wet in urine puddles, there was no staff available to change them. That is something which was seen by a member of my staff.

On the sixth floor a woman unravelled a dressing and began to scratch off the scabs from a very infected area on the leg and there was no staff person available to notice it or to rebandage it. "I went to the front desk of the floor to tell someone and there was no one there."

Middlesex Terrace, just outside London: Short-staffed; complaints were backed by both staff and residents. When I walked into the home an alarm sounded. We could find no one on the first floor to shut off the alarm, no staff or administrator, and the alarm rang for at least half an hour. There were 12 residents on this floor standing in the hall or sitting and there were no staff. The staff were all in the basement helping to feed residents. There were no extras to watch those finished or not eating on other floors.

4:10 p.m.

The evidence is overwhelming. It is overwhelming that there is a significant staff problem in these nursing homes, from the statements that have been made by many residents, many people who care for residents, by the staff itself, and from what has been seen, if I may say so, on a firsthand basis in a number of nursing homes that have been visited by my staff in the last five weeks.

Why is there inadequate staffing? There is inadequate staffing because these operations are run on a cost-cutting basis. There is inadequate staffing because the way in which these homes make a profit, the only way a home can make a profit—this may sound remarkably simple, and it is remarkably simple—is if they are able to take in more than they spend. So there is a given incentive in the system. The incentive is right there for a philosophy of cutback, of watering down things wherever it is possible. That is where the operator, that is where the owner, that is where the industry makes its profit.

It makes its profit by not having enough staff. It makes its profit by short-staffing on certain shifts. It makes its profit by deciding that it will, as a matter of policy, feed people when it is convenient to it. The evidence of the Ark Eden home was exactly that. There were people being awakened very early in the morning. There were people being forced to eat very quickly,

many of them suffering from physical disabilities which made that very difficult.

That is not a happenstance problem; that is a problem which is endemic to the way in which this industry is organized. All I can say is God help the hospitals in Ontario if the Tory government has its way and runs every single hospital on exactly the same basis. God help us all, because the kind of inadequate care that we see in the nursing home industry is just the thin edge of the wedge. It is the beginning of the trend which the Tories would like to see imposed on the entire province and on the entire health care system.

The second problem is fire hazards. In most cases these regulations were being met. However, the more important issue is the regulations which are not in place.

For example, residents in beds and wheelchairs still have ground floor access either from being placed on the ground floor or ramp access. It appears that residents lining the hallways are now considered to be in violation of the regulations. However, there is a problem of enforcement, and in a couple of moments we will see the examples that are there.

Leisure World is one example—I love the names of these places. On the second floor of Leisure World there are crowds of people in wheelchairs near the nursing station and the elevators. In case of fire, there is no room to move quickly. About St. Raphael's Nursing Home on McNicoll, that is the one that is still open, there are complaints by residents and families that there has never been a fire drill as required in regulations and there are people lining the hallways on each floor.

Central Park Lodge: The halls are also packed with people. Barton Place: Many residents lining the hallways on the sixth floor; several food and cleaning carts also impeding access. Apparently the inspector had cited residents in the halls on the third floor as a fire hazard. The home had done nothing to rectify the complaint until CITY-TV shot film of the residents lining the third floor. So what did it do? It moved them up to the seventh floor and lined them up there.

There are heavy care patients on the sixth and seventh floors, 78 residents in total, no easy access out in a fire. One elevator out of two always functioning improperly; that was confirmed by the staff.

Oakridge Villa: Third floor heavy care; no ramp access to ground, two elevators go very slow. Chateau Garden in Kirkland Lake apparently has no guidelines for safe exit from the

building. There were complaints that when the alarm went off there was complete chaos. The residents in the wheelchairs said they would have no way of leaving the building.

Lincoln Place: Heavy care patients on the fourth, fifth and sixth floors lining the hallways; two very slow elevators. It would be impossible to evacuate during a fire.

Heritage Nursing Home: Heavy care on the fourth floor; same problems of access and slow elevators.

Any staff I spoke to suggested the heavy care patients were always put high up in the building because they are less visible to visitors—the healthier, higher-functioning residents are then on display—and to cut down on elevator time to carry ambulatory residents to and from the dining room, etc.

Should cosmetic appearances somehow take priority over human safety? Should we somehow be prevented from seeing the things that can happen to any of us and all of us, either in old age or in sickness?

Surely the principle should be that care for the person, regardless of how they look, how old they may be or how sick they may be, is more important than the cosmetics of wanting people only to see the bright side of what nursing home care in this province is all about.

The enforcement of existing standards—and it is important to distinguish between these where enforcement is inadequate and those deficiencies in the system due to failure to set actual standards. We could only monitor those standards visible to the eye; we could not go into the kitchen, for example. Again, this is on the basis of what was seen by my staff. I am just putting it into the record because people should know about these things.

Middlesex Terrace: Paint and plaster peeling off the walls in the bedroom on the first floor; smell of urine in several parts of the home; terrible smell throughout the home like rotten eggs—staff member understands that is a sulphur problem which the home has been slow to correct—beds not placed far enough from walls, windows and drafts as required; the beds were also in extremely poor condition; linen clean but smells of the rotten eggs from the sulphur in the laundry water; the residents also drink this water.

Tyndall Nursing Home: Towels and face cloths not always available; there is no soap in the bathroom; incomplete baths—regulations call for a complete bath once per week for ambulatory residents and daily or more fre-

quent baths for incontinent residents or those confined to bed; for example, wheelchair-confined resident was given a half-bath once per week—again, once a week for a bath; complaints that blankets are not always available.

Central Park Lodge: Inadequate ventilation; strong odours on some floors and elevators; beds placed too close to walls; some rooms and washrooms did not have towels and face cloths; the string removed from a call station on a resident's bed.

Castlevue: Inadequate ventilation; odours on every floor; no curtains or tracks on ceilings for curtains; cold water for bathing residents; snacks with high caloric value and low nutrient value.

Leisure World: Beds not placed adequately apart; odours very strong on the second floor.

St. Raphael's: Odours exceptionally bad; Concerned Friends have complained about this to the ministry; inadequate clean linen—inadequate clean linen in 1983, in a place that is caring for senior citizens in this province; inadequate face cloths, towels; bed-confined residents and incontinent residents not given a daily bath; residents appeared very dirty, especially unclean hair.

White Eagle: No daily baths for incontinent, bedridden residents; beds not adequately spaced; complaints about nutrition; complaints about salty food given to a resident on a salt-free diet; foods not blended for a resident who could not chew; nursing home will not provide the diapers and families have to purchase them; no menus posted and complaints that they never are; no liquids left out for residents even after families specifically requested; lack of privacy—a nurse stripped down a resident in front of four other people and did not close the door; draft due to open windows to cut down on odours.

Chateau Nursing Home, Kirkland Lake: Improper time to feed MR kids; food shovelled in faster than possible to eat; improper positioning of residents; guidelines for each patient ignored—we know what happened to the triministry guidelines in the case of the poor Soumelidis child—guidelines for each patient ignored; the administrator would not allow the guidelines to be posted on the bed for easy access; administrator reluctant to buy plastic nipples for children without the sucking reflex so the staff took up a collection among themselves and bought the supply—do a whip-round in order to buy people some plastic nipples; no menus posted; rubber foot rests removed from wheelchairs to prevent marking of walls—the result is that limbs hang. This seems to be

extremely dangerous for the circulation and the health of the residents.

It goes on and on; Barton Place, the Heritage Nursing Home again, problems at Lincoln Place, problems with linen. Just to give another example: Lincoln Place—"Urine uncleared under residents' chairs on the sixth floor; portable urinals were filthy. I looked at several, apparently only cleaned quickly with a brush; linens had same heavy smells as the air; bed-confined residents not turned every two hours." That was again confirmed by the staff. "Bathing not as frequent or as thorough as required." Again, that was confirmed by the staff.

Finally, we come to the problem which is perhaps most fundamental to what happens to our senior citizens and the fate of people who enter nursing homes and who, by and large, do not leave them. That is the lack of activity or stimulation of residents.

4:20 p.m.

In this instance, I think it is harder to go through on a case-by-case basis because it is subjective, but perhaps I can give members the sense I have. I have been to a number of nursing homes. I enjoy visiting nursing homes and talking to senior citizens. I enjoy playing the piano with them, chatting with them and getting them to chat about themselves. We all know how lonely many seniors are and how difficult their lives are because they are often not visited enough by friends and family. It leaves a tremendous obligation on the institutions in this province to provide a stimulating environment.

The other day I was in a nursing home in Windsor. I was going to play the piano for the residents downstairs. There were a number of them there and there was a fellow in the corner. A great many of the seniors were lined up and many of them were very reluctant to establish eye contact. Because so many of them have never had anybody actually talk to them, they are really bowled over when someone carries on a whole conversation with them. There was one fellow there I went over and talked to. I asked how he was doing and he did not answer. I went right up to him and spoke very loudly in his ear. He responded that he was fine. He was 83 years old, he was feeling fine, he was very alert and the only problem was he was deaf and blind. Mentally he was completely alert.

I do not think it is just a question of what governments do; it is a question of what society does or what we all do as individuals. As people get older and suffer from increasing physical disabilities, there is always an assumption that

mental slowness is there as well. There is an assumption that because people are not talking an awful lot—and sometimes there may even be a physical disability such as a stroke that will impair speech—mental alertness, mental ability, mental agility and mental interest are gone as well.

The problem here is not any individual home; it is the institutional model. In a sense it is the private enterprise model, because that model is designed to have as few staff as possible. We have instances, for example, where there are very large homes and very few people able to provide any kind of recreational assistance.

How many homes have we all been in where the main recreational activity is television? That is all there is; that is it; there is nothing else. For hours on end, the people sit around watching TV. I do not happen to believe they are there entirely as a matter of choice. We all know television has become the world's greatest babysitter for many young people. I suggest that for many people in our institutions—and in many people's private homes, but this is another problem—television has also become the alternative to stimulation, the alternative to care and the alternative to intervention.

Why has that situation been allowed to develop? I suggest it is partly because of the completely inadequate way we have of assessing people and the complete lack of synchronization between institutions and the people who happen to be in them. It is fair to say there are a great many people in nursing homes who are very sick. They are in nursing homes and not in chronic care hospitals because there are not a hell of a lot of beds in chronic care hospitals right now, because there are certainly no chronic care beds in acute care hospitals right now, and because many nursing homes—and I salute them for it—have taken the decision that they would rather care for somebody who has been there for a long time than move him or her inappropriately to another place.

What this really means is that there is now a very wide range of people who are in these institutions, and completely inadequate programs are designed to provide the kind of activity, stimulation and participation that all of us would basically like to have as we get older.

I will just give members again some eyewitness accounts.

Oakridge Villa: Visited one resident, a stroke victim. Paralysis in both legs and one arm but very alert mind. She is placed on a floor with the very senile and emotionally disturbed. There is

no intellectual stimulation, and the recreational programs scheduled, although better for most, are not appropriate for her. Again, they are not designed for, are not tailored to this person's needs and concerns. The same floor has excessive noise from residents screaming and yelling, making it stressful for those who are more alert. Many residents complained about a problem of theft.

Tyndall Nursing Home: Again, many people slumped over in their chairs, possible signs of overmedication, a problem I am going to come to in a moment.

Heritage Nursing Home: All those I spoke to, about 15 residents, were desperate for simple conversation. Which one of us cannot say that we have been in exactly the same situation, where people are just desperate for company, desperate for that amount of stimulation, desperate for that conversation?

I do not think loneliness is a part of the human condition; I think loneliness is something that we as a society do to people. I do not think the people in nursing homes are lonely because they want to be lonely, and I think there is something we can do about it and have to do about it.

How many times does one go into homes and see people, many of them, lining the hallways, some with many indications of overmedication? I am going to come back to that problem in a moment.

Central Park Lodge: The staff ratio for recreation is one to 100. One hundred people with totally different needs, with a complete variety of needs and concerns and interests, and you have got one person. You simply cannot rely entirely on volunteers to do it, though I know there are many people who do act as volunteers, and again we salute them; many of us have done it as well. But you just cannot rely on them.

I said I would mention the problem of medication, and I do want to say something about it. I know people are going to say: "This is a medical decision that is taken. These are medical prescriptions that are signed by doctors, and there are no grounds for concern. If you have a concern about an individual case, take it to the College of Physicians and Surgeons," and so on. A lot of good that is going to do us. We know how well that procedure works out.

I do want to suggest that there is a very real problem with the overuse of drugs in our society in general, but there is also a very real problem with respect to the overuse of drugs in nursing homes and in our institutions of all kinds. I dearly wish the minister would wake up to this

question, because in part it is not simply a one-on-one, individual medical decision: it is a practice increasingly accepted by a great many people in the medical profession, and that practice is of concern to a great many others in the medical profession.

I know because they have talked and written to me about it: instances where people are simply being put on a program and a pattern of taking drugs for an extended period of time; a problem of overmedication that is causing people to lose the alertness, the sense of activity and the sense of interest and stimulation they had in a pattern of a passive life rather than an active life, a problem that is so much a part of being in an institution; and that has to be broken.

I have taken some time on this and I have gone through it as best I can. For the record I want to pay particular tribute to those members of my staff who took a great deal of time and interest in this project. I want to thank those individuals and residents, and I want to thank a great many administrators of nursing homes for being open to our concerns.

I want to reiterate what I said at the beginning of my remarks with respect to what is happening to the nursing home business and to senior citizens in this province.

4:30 p.m.

As I said earlier, I am not suggesting for a moment that every single nursing home in this province is some kind of hell hole. I am not suggesting there are not many nursing homes that provide good care. I believe very strongly that the staff and administration of a great many of the nursing homes in this province care very deeply about the work they do.

I am suggesting that the private profit model, the private profit method of delivery of care, the private profit system is what is wrong, and no amount of fiddling around on the edges or fiddling around with the regulations is going to affect that particular problem and that particular issue. We have a system in this province that gives each and every nursing home operator a stake in providing less service than should be provided.

Some provide a good service. Some are not interested in making a whole lot of money. Many of them are voluntary organizations. Many of them are church nonprofit organizations. I think members will find that the pattern of care in many of those institutions is quite different from that which is to be found in those that are run on a private profit basis.

The member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick)

and I know very well some of the institutions in the east end that are run by the United Church or run by the Presbyterian Church. There are a number I visited in Toronto run by the Anglicans. I have been to some run by the Italian community and many run on a nonprofit basis by many communities. The issues there are slightly different and perhaps broader with respect to how we care for seniors and what we are doing for people as they get older in our society.

But I suggest that no amount of surface dancing by the Minister of Health (Mr. Grossman), no amount of mere cleverness is going to get around this problem, which is that a big industry has grown up in this province that has a stake in providing private profit care, a big industry that has very close ties to the Tory party and indeed to the Ministry of Health in this province under a Tory administration, and that is a very unhealthy situation, to put it very mildly.

I want to put the minister on notice that the activities of this industry and the activities of this big business are going to come under a scrutiny in this province such as they have never had before, because we think it is fundamentally wrong, fundamentally inappropriate for us to be providing care for senior citizens on a private profit basis.

I said to you earlier, Mr. Speaker, that many nursing homes are in the business of providing chronic care. I want to suggest that what is really at stake here has been a fundamental change in the kind of care that is being provided and the sort of work that is being done.

Nursing homes are not hotels; nursing homes are not apartments. Nursing homes are, quite simply, places where care is being provided. Of course there is a residential component, but we are looking at a continuum of care in our society. I do not think that caring is something we can put a dollar figure on. I do not think we can say somehow that somebody is suddenly well and then somebody is suddenly sick, that they suddenly go from a state of wellness to a state of sickness and that the Ontario health insurance plan is prepared to cover the state of sickness but the OHIP system and the idea of universal medical insurance are inappropriate for when one is in a state of wellness.

What is at stake here is a pattern of care from the time one is born to the time one dies. The medicare system grew up in response to a very real concern in society about caring for illness. We in our party, and I am thinking particularly

of people like Tommy Douglas, Woodrow Lloyd and those great pioneers of our party, fought, and who really fought hard, against the prophets of private enterprise and those who would simply make health care a commodity like any other.

They were talking about something that those who introduced medicare in Ontario, the Tory party, do not understand. They were talking about a model of care that goes from the time one is born to the time one dies. The family will provide one with care, and we should be doing a hell of a lot more to provide help and assistance for families who want to provide care for people—whether they are young or old or mentally retarded or whatever they may happen to be—an awful lot more than we are doing.

What has captured the Tory imagination, if I may use that term in its loosest sense, is the completely fatuous notion that we can somehow separate the notion of illness from the notion of wellness. They are prepared to accept that for a short, acute illness they will accept the principle that one should not have to pay thousands and thousands of dollars. One might have to pay hundreds of dollars; in fact, we have increasing evidence that people are paying hundreds, except that it is in terms of a catastrophic illness.

When I hear the Minister of Health say he now accepts the principles of some kind of medicare and he accepts accessibility and so on, I believe what he says in terms of an acute situation; that if one breaks a leg one should be able to go to the hospital and not be charged thousands and thousands of dollars. I accept it when he says that.

But the issue is so much broader than that, because what are we really talking about when we see someone go into a nursing home? Old age is not a sickness. Old age is something that happens to all of us; getting older is a fact of life. But the fact remains that one's ability to care for oneself can vary according to circumstances, in terms of longer-term disability, in terms of perhaps having had a stroke when one is very young or having had a very serious accident when one is very young, or simply in terms of what happens as a result of getting frailer and getting older.

I want to suggest to the House that it is beyond me how we can go on any longer with a pattern of delivery of care which accepts private profit and private enrichment as the model in our society when it comes to people who are in the nearly 30,000 beds that are currently occu-

pied by a great many senior citizens and others in nursing homes in Ontario.

It does not make any sense to me why, for example, a nursing home can say to a resident, "You will be cared for by our doctor; you will not be cared for by your doctor." It does not make any sense to me that a nursing home can actually prevent a doctor from coming into the home. It does not make any sense to me that a nursing home can make all kinds of rules and regulations which have nothing to do with its public obligation. What makes the least sense of all to me is that we would have a Tory government in this province which would allow that kind of situation to carry on and pretend it is some kind of accident. It is not an accident; that is what the system is all about.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to you that if a patient had a complaint about the care that was being provided in a public hospital in this province I do not think there are very many of us who would fear a reprisal against the patient who made that complaint, because we have a public system in which publicity and the light of publicity and a sense of public accountability are there.

It is absolutely absurd that the care for 30,000 of our fellow citizens should be done on a basis of some kind of wall being put up, the light being shut out, inspectors being able to go in every once in a while, after people hear on the t.v. that the inspector is coming, with things then going back to a condition where they are not acceptable.

It is intolerable that we do not have laws in this province that provide for the light of day, that provide for residents' rights, that provide for full publicity, that provide for protection of people's privacy rights, that provide for their right to go to a doctor of their own choice, that provide for complete freedom of access by the family or any other person who is chosen by the resident to represent him or her. It is absolutely astonishing that we do not have that kind of system in this province.

It is appalling that we have regulations saying that in nursing homes that are providing chronic care and heavy care the basic standard of nursing care provided is going to be one and a half hours. It is absolutely appalling in this day and age that this would happen. Most of all, it is appalling that we would be giving our seniors so little choice.

4:40 p.m.

I started my remarks by talking about what happens to families when they are suddenly faced with a situation where they realize they

are no longer able to care for someone in their own home. First of all, in the majority of communities in this province that choice has to be made by them because the government of this province does not provide the kind of assistance that is necessary to people who want to care for their relatives at home.

This government had the gall to announce a program last year in which it was going to be extending home care services and it did nothing for a whole year. It then had the absolute gall to come out in the throne speech and say, "This continues to be an area of concern for our party." What absolute rubbish.

The emperor really has not a stitch on when it comes to home care services in this province. The Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto can produce a report saying neighbourhood support services are in a state of underfunding and in a state of crisis in this province, and we have the Minister of Health repeating: "These programs are coming. They are coming. They are coming." It just will not do. Families should not be put in this position.

There are families—and again I want people to know and the minister to know we will be introducing these people to the minister and introducing examples to the minister—who are spending literally thousands and thousands of dollars a year on long-term care. This is happening in a province where the government says it believes in universal medical care.

It may do when it comes to something called acute sickness, when one breaks a leg or goes into the hospital. When it comes to the reality of people being neither in a state of real illness nor in a state of real wellness, long-term disabilities, the cost to those families is appalling and the assistance from this government is virtually nil.

The policy of this government, because of its failure to provide choices and because of its failure to provide home care, in fact relegates, forces families into the position of saying, "The only way we can get any money from this government is if we send dad or mom into an institution." It would be a hell of a lot cheaper to give families money to keep people at home. It would make a lot more sense.

If this government were really interested in providing health care and in providing care in a way that was human and was down to earth it would make a lot more sense for the government to say to families: "You have a doctor's certificate here saying this person is ill and needs help. Fine. Instead of sending him into an institution, we will pay you to provide the care."

There are a great many families that would say, "That is much better than sending him into an institution." In the current state of many of our institutions, I could hardly blame them.

It is a question of the government responding to the need for care. That is something this government is not prepared to do, because it sees the world in a profit-and-loss private enrichment perspective. There is a large industry in this province, 340 homes providing 30,000 beds, the vast majority of those private care. Extendicare has made enough money out of the nursing home business in this province and elsewhere to be able to buy a life insurance company. This is not a small battle we are taking on here.

Mr. McClellan: It wanted to buy Crown Trust.

Mr. Rae: It wanted to buy Crown Trust. Perhaps that would have been a good buy, I do not know.

The point is this: The links between this government and this party and that industry and the health care business—and it should never be a business, but there are those in that party who want it to be a business and who think it is a business—are close.

Earlier I quoted a former official of the Ministry of Health, a senior executive on the board of AMI. We know that a former official of the Ministry of Health is the president of Extendicare Ltd., health care division, and former executive directors of the Ontario Nursing Homes Association are now executives of the Diversicare Corp. There are ties and links and interlocking networks which perhaps explain why the policy is as absurd as it is.

In closing my remarks with respect to the challenge facing health care in this province, I want to suggest that there are frontiers of health.

My colleague the member for Sudbury East (Mr. Martel), our House leader, who has done such a remarkable job—and I want to pay him public tribute today for the work he has done on behalf of injured workers throughout this province and those people fighting the battle for decent conditions in their working environments—will be making his remarks in the next few days with respect to a report on occupational health and safety.

We will be focusing our efforts on the need for environmental health and environmental cleanup, but perhaps most fundamentally we will be focusing our efforts and attention on the need for us to look at the health care system as a

caring system and not as a profit-making system. That is the direction and focus of our work.

The battle that was fought by our party in the 1940s and 1950s and the early 1960s to provide medical care for those suffering from acute illness was just the beginning. There are new frontiers of care which are currently occupied by the barons of financial power and those who would seek to make them a world for their own private enrichment. I want to put them on notice that the frontier is up for grabs because the New Democratic Party intends to fight for those people.

I said I wanted to say a few words about jobs and housing as well. I will not take quite as long as I have with respect to health care.

Mr. Laughren: Oh, come on.

Mr. Rae: I know that will come as a great disappointment to my colleague the member for Nickel Belt, who hangs on every word I say. Although he does not agree with every word I say, he does hang on it.

I do want to pay tribute to another one of my colleagues and also draw on his own experience and his remarkable ability to highlight and to bring out a human focus and a human touch to what has increasingly been seen as an impersonal, theoretical, statistical problem. Of course, I am speaking of the problem of joblessness, of unemployment and the tremendous challenge that faces our society in coming to grips with the full meaning of this issue.

The Liberal Party has now staked its claim to a budget which it is calling a recovery budget. I think the Liberal Party budget has nothing whatsoever to do with recovery and I think the questions we asked in the Legislature today and the answers we got from the Minister of Labour (Mr. Ramsay) show how little it has to do with recovery.

The Liberal Party budget was a business budget which was said to give help to what they call the private sector. I want to suggest that one cannot attach any single job, one particular opportunity for employment, to the thousands of dollars thrown at the private sector by the Liberal Party in its most recent budget. It is a void, vapid, incredibly right-wing document which simply throws money at big business and then says, "Go to it, boys, try to create some jobs or do whatever you want to do with what we are giving you."

I suggest the evidence is overwhelming in terms of the rationalization that we have seen in industry after industry in this province that there is no correlation whatsoever between the

investment the private sector is making and the creation of jobs, no correlation at all.

4:50 p.m.

When Canada Packers goes out and buys some new plant that is an investment, is that investment creating any new jobs? No, it is not, because there is no requirement attached to that investment that it be tied to the creation of work in our society. There is no requirement at all. Any assistance that is given to the private sector that is not directly tied to the creation of jobs and the creation of work is completely and totally irresponsible. It flies in the face of everything we know about the economy and what needs to be done to get people back to work.

If you want to get people back to work, Mr. Speaker, you simply have to offer them jobs and the opportunities for work. If the government thinks it is going to come trickling down from Canada Packers, Consolidated-Bathurst and the other corporations which rule over much of our economy in this province, it is going to wait for one hell of a long time, far longer than anyone in our party is prepared to wait.

Of course, that old hoary alliance between the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) and Mr. Lalonde has produced the Treasurer's response and the response of the Premier (Mr. Davis). I have always felt it would perhaps be more appropriate if the Premier ran for the leadership of the Liberal Party in Ottawa rather than the leadership of the Tory party in Ottawa.

Mr. Laughren: Not to mention Peterson.

Mr. Rae: Not to mention Peterson, that is right.

That response was that this was a step in the right direction and our Treasurer was intending to go in the same direction.

Mr. Kolyin: The member is floundering.

Mr. Rae: The member for Lakeshore has finally woken up. I appreciate his presence here this afternoon. I would simply like to read to him some of the letters which my colleague the member for Scarborough West (Mr. R. F. Johnston) received in response to his advertisement in many newspapers asking people to tell their story with respect to what was happening to them so that they would stop being a statistic.

There are countless letters. I have only a few of them here and there are many of them. I know some of them were sent over to the Treasurer. We then wrote back to the individuals and some of them wrote back to us. I hope

very much that the Treasurer listens to the voice of these people, listens very carefully to what they are saying, because what they are saying is that they need work more than anything else.

They need work, not in six months or in 12 months; they do not need work to come from whatever corporate benefactor it is going to come from in five or six years' time. They need work today. They need work now. They need jobs now. They need work that is productive, work that is going to do something for them and something for the province. There is an overwhelming sense of frustration and anguish on the part of these people that their voice has not been listened to by governments, that they are simply a statistic and that they are treated by people as statistics. This is what is so sad in our society.

I would like to quote from a letter from a young woman. I do not want to read the whole letter because it is very long and she talks about a great many situations.

She is a graphic artist of some experience who has worked in many different places and has a number of degrees. She is a graduate of the Northern Alberta Institute of Technology in Edmonton and has attended high school in Ontario. She describes her frustration with a number of job applications that she has made, the responses she has been getting and the fact that she feels she is just wasting her time making so many applications and getting absolutely nowhere.

Just to quote part: "I applied for a waitress position"—this is a woman who has a lot of experience as a graphic artist—"and they asked me for my experience. I used to do this during high school and college but, unbelievably, they want people who have been doing this recently." So she did not get that job.

"I applied for a printing salesman position. I had not done this before, but as a graphic artist I know a lot about printing. While they did like my resumé, they told me they had had applications from salesmen who had been working in the printing business for 15 years. They told me they may have a part-time position coming up for a graphic artist and will call me if they need me. I hear that a lot. They like my resumé but they do not have work."

She goes on to describe many other similar circumstances. She says her rent is \$315. She will not be able to find another place to live. She is going to have to sell her car. She says she is not placed in absolute destitution.

"I should tell you that my fiancé will support

me in the event I am not able to support myself. He will not let me go to welfare. For this I am grateful but it does not sit well. In my entire life since I left home I have not depended on anyone. I used to make \$18,000 a year. As time goes on, I find this difficult to believe, but as my copies of my tax returns show, things were really different a year ago. I actually owe \$10 this year. I would like to know what the government has done for this \$10 over and above the \$4,500 I already gave it."

Then she says something which caught me, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure it will have the same impact on you. "I used to feel uncomfortable about coming into their office"—she is talking about the unemployment insurance office—"and mingling with the shabbily dressed individuals examining the job board. Now I find I dress a lot like them. This leads me to wonder if our medical profession is going to discover a new neurosis, unemployment sickness, to take its place beside all the other new mental illnesses of the latter half of the 20th century.

"This sickness would be marked by the patients' steady degeneration of their self-esteem, lack of concern for their personal appearance, progressive withdrawal socially and eventually emotionally. At the onset of this illness, the patients would display anger towards everything in general but slowly regress into apathy. They would have no long-term goals, display a defeatist attitude. Some may tend towards alcohol dependence and complain more of stress-induced symptoms like ulcers, headaches and just general malaise.

"This all sounds dramatic, but I have seen all this in friends of mine and I am starting to see this in myself too. That's scary. I try to keep myself busy, though lack of money prevents me from doing a lot of things I used to do for enjoyment. At least I can thank you for this opportunity to put some of my feelings down on paper and thank you again for listening."

How we in our party would like to be able to do more than just listen. How we would like to be able to do something for the person who wrote that letter.

Another letter says: "Dear Mr. Johnston: I do not feel it would be of any help to me to go public and perhaps it may be a problem, so please do not use my name." This should hit home to the Premier. "I have arranged to go to Calgary to look for work, though I don't think there is any better chance there. I have also had some contact with an east coast company. I would really like to remain in Ontario, although

it now seems impossible. If there are any make-work projects for engineers, I would love to hear about it."

What the hell has happened to this province so that now in 1983 we have young engineers writing in to us saying they have to go out west, although they do not think there will be any better chance there, or they may be going down east, and they would like to remain in Ontario, although it now seems impossible? What kind of a disgraceful situation is that for the government of Ontario to have allowed to happen in this province?

I will read a couple of other letters, because they do give a sense of what is going on out there. I am not suggesting any government can wave a wand and solve this entire problem, but I am suggesting the Tory government of Ontario has a moral obligation and a moral contract with the people of this province to provide as much work as possible through the public sector, if necessary, or the private sector.

5 p.m.

Do it. Just do it. Do not wait for it to trickle down through the tax system. Do not wait for some manna from heaven or for Marc Lalonde because God knows that is not going to happen. Do not wait around for the Premier to make up his mind as to whether or not he is going to run or maybe run, because Lord only knows whether that is going to happen. Bring in a budget on May 10 which will provide jobs and hope for the kind of person who wrote this letter. Bring in a budget that will mean that this person will be allowed to stay in Ontario rather than have to leave the province where he was born, brought up and where he wants to stay.

That is the issue right here. The issue again is choice. The issue is opportunity. The fact is we have a government today which is not prepared to do the things that will create choices and opportunities for people when it comes to jobs.

I want to read just two other letters, because they are moving and because they do speak to what is happening in this province. One is from a gentleman who, again, has asked to remain nameless.

"Dear Sir:

"I would like to thank you for the letter dated April 8, 1983"—the letter is not written in perfect English, but I will read it as written because it seems to me to make much more sense that way—"and appreciated to hearing lots of taking responsibility for the public and interesting to establish happy family life.

"I heard good news today. I hope growth th

notice that we in our party take this job very seriously, and we are going to continue to speak up on these issues of health, housing and jobs with all the strength, all the conviction and all the sincerity we can muster.

It has been a year since I became the leader of our party. I can say it has been a very eventful year. It has been a very educational year for me but, if I may say so, it has just been the first year and I am looking forward more than I can say to leading my good friends and colleagues, and to leading our party to victory in Ontario.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. At this time I would like to recognize the member for Prince Edward-Lennox.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was going to start off by making some comments in regard to our economy and certain observations in matters economic—

Mr. Laughtren: Nursing homes too.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: But the member for Nickel Belt is right. He said nursing homes. I must say that I was impressed with the leader of the third party in regard to the sincerity that he expressed when he reviewed the plight of so many people in this province. I think it is a genuine concern, a real concern. I think it is a concern that affects the individual as a whole.

I recall not too long ago the member for Sudbury East (Mr. Martel) addressing the concerns of the injured worker and the functioning of the Workers' Compensation Board, the need to look at the individual as a whole person. I was impressed at that time with the member's sensitivity in regard to his keen concern for the welfare of a fellow member of the human race, not just as a citizen of Ontario or Canada, but as a human being.

I, too, have visited a lot of nursing homes over the past dozen years and I have seen the introduction of our legislation and the regulations, the evolution of the nursing home as an institution. I have watched the institutionalization of health care, of services to people who at one time we as individuals used to look at as fellow human beings and do what we could to help.

Coming from a small community in northern Ontario and having left it, because they did not build universities in the bush in those days, for the big city of Toronto, I had a different outlook in terms of the makeup of the community. We had all kinds of people in our community of Timmins. That was the community where I was born and raised. We had people who were

exceptionally bright and people who were exceptionally dull, people who were tall and people who were short, some people who had physical disabilities or mental disabilities, even people with red hair, and some without hair. Maybe that is why I spent some time thinking about this matter. It was a small community in those days. I suppose in the more difficult times, through the 1930s and 1940s, people had more of a concern for their fellow men. There was not the division on political grounds. It was a matter of addressing need where need existed.

I looked at that and the fact that one generation looked after another generation, and then we had the unravelling of a system into an institutionalized system where government seemed to take over many of the functions the family at one time played. I think of the changing times themselves, the changing economy, the changing work force, and I cannot fault children for not being able to look after ageing parents. There are situations where parents require 24-hour care. That is not possible in the home. We have medical science extending the life expectancy of people, and with that extension of our lifespan we have a threat to the dignity of the human being.

Where is the dignity of someone living in a nursing home under the conditions described by the member of the third party? There is no dignity in life under those conditions.

I suggest our nursing homes are becoming too large. I see this in the cities. This is why I am referring to this subject matter as well: In terms of what has happened on the world picture in our economy, the structural changes that have taken place, we see a shift away from mass production, from high volume, standardized production. That is now moving out to the Third World countries. I am going to address that matter more fully in a moment.

5:20 p.m.

Mr. Nixon: Just like Cherry Valley.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: I see that standardized, volume production in our health care system, and I see it more as I come from the smaller areas: the Cherry Valleys—that is right—the Cherry Valleys, the Selbys, the Pictons and the Napanees. I see the change from smaller facilities, where people are treated as human beings, where their total body is treated as the subject matter for care and concern and where there is some milk of human kindness, where people

matter. As those institutions get larger and larger, one sees that mass production has set in.

Mr. Stokes: Like the cheese business.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: I know the member for Lake Nipigon likes cheese and I understand what has happened in the cheese factories, but it is not that situation at all. That economic evolution may be justified in the production of cheese and milk, but I do not think you can justify these human filing cabinets in the care of human beings.

At one time when one asked what was the viable size of a nursing home, the answer was about 40 beds. Then it became 60 beds. Recently I asked what size of nursing home you must have in order to have a viable economic operation so you could give people the kind of care they required and so the doors could remain open. The answer was 100. So we see an ever-escalating theory of greater volume and mass production in nursing home care.

Mr. Laughren: That is the profit motive.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: The profit motive? No, I do not think it is.

One point the leader of the New Democratic Party did not touch on that he might have—and I am sure he will as he pursues this matter further—is the value that nursing beds have taken on in the transfer of nursing homes. It seems to me somewhat obscene to attach an economic value to empty beds regardless of what physical structure or site there may be. I put that to the members, because surely there must be some reason for it. When that value attaches to the bed, I am sure it may reflect on the care that the residents in those homes receive.

I am not sure, but I think it is something that might be looked into and I think the size of institutions is something that might be looked into, because that is where you get the articles of clothing that the leader of the third party spoke about being lost and put on other people, the homogenization of the process, the standardization. There are no really special diets, in the strict sense of the word, for people who need special diets, because again it is mass production. The missing articles, the seeming theft that was referred to, these are all matters that are of some concern.

I do not think the answer is a complete deinstitutionalization. I think there will always be a need for institutions. We talk of our professional social workers, we speak glowingly of deinstitutionalization and the utilization of

the generic services of the community, and we apply all the correct jargon, but sometimes we seem to forget the individuals themselves. The system often absorbs the energies and the moneys so that what the system is set up to serve really does not transpire as fully as it might.

I do not think nationalization of a system necessarily produces people who have a sincere and genuine concern for residents in nursing homes. When I see some of the staff in nursing homes, in my view they are heroes to be working in places like that and under conditions like that. People are quick to criticize, but in general terms I think they are doing a tremendous job which not many people would want to do. I certainly commend them for that.

Maybe it is a matter of mentality and spirit, but I think we have to take on more of a charitable sense about it. That is the human quality I have spoken of and the leader of the third party has referred to. We cannot turn charity into a crown corporation and make the good Samaritan a civil servant. I do not think it is the simplistic type of argument we can use.

Mr. Laughren: They might mug you in the corridors of power.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: If the member would like to decoy me into other avenues, I could quote from speeches I have made in the past and I would be delighted to do that some time, but I want to keep on track today if I may.

I could not fail to respond to the thrust and substance of the remarks of the member's leader when he was commenting on the present situation in regard to nursing homes. As he has said, we do have excellent nursing homes and they are run in an excellent fashion. I have found there is a great variety of nursing homes, not just in size because when one reaches a certain size there is a problem, but also in administration, the type of people who are running those homes and the staff they have. I think a person has a better chance in a smaller community.

However, I went into that because I had occasion not long ago to read an article in *The Atlantic Monthly* for March of this year called "The Next American Frontier." It was pointed out in that article that the recession we are experiencing, which began in 1981, will end eventually, but the underlying problems of the American economy will not come to an end with the next upturn in the business cycle unless American industry undertakes some basic changes in its organization of production.

There is a prediction that unemployment will

remain high, that millions of jobs in the nation's basic industries will never return and the American standard of living will continue to decline.

I point that out because with the Canadian economy tied in with the American economy the way it is, this is very appropriate to the situation in this country. It goes on to point out: "Between 1920 and 1970, business, labour and government hewed to a set of organizing principles which were originally called "scientific management", in which tasks were simplified according to established rules and carefully monitored. These principles were put into effect by a new class of professional managers. High volume, scientifically managed industry producing standardized goods generated vast economies of scale and levels of wealth unparalleled in history."

I was thinking of that particular reference when I listened to the speech of the leader of the third party with regard to nursing homes.

5:30 p.m.

The article goes on to point out what happened in the United States in regard to manufacturing capacity employed in production, which had reached 86 per cent in 1965. Then there was the downward trend to 80 per cent in the 1970s. It fell to 70 per cent by 1982. Only 3.5 per cent of the labour force was jobless in 1969, but thereafter unemployment climbed. It reached almost 11 per cent last year. By the 1980s many basic industries were in trouble. These are the automobile industry, petrochemicals, textiles and so on. We had with that, I may say, a slowdown in productivity growth.

There was an interesting observation made that the roots of the problem are embedded very deeply in our business enterprises, in labour unions and government institutions. There are a lot of scapegoats used to rationalize the situation. Government regulation was one. Government was blamed, through regulation, as being the culprit. The imposition of environmental laws was another. Safety regulations was another, the safety and health of the worker in the work place.

When you looked at these expenditures for the United States, for example, the combined safety regulations and pollution control regulations never exceeded six per cent of industrial investment and can be blamed, at the most, for one tenth of the slowdown in productivity.

Government deficits were blamed as well. The inadequate capital formation was blamed. There were all kinds of reasons that were advanced for the downturn in the economy,

including, of course, escalating energy prices, except that the oil shock affected all nations, including Germany and Japan, which were really more dependent on imported energy than was America. We could see what happened in terms of the American economic decline and the decline in the economies of a number of these other countries.

What is pointed out is that all these matters that were blamed really overlooked the worldwide reorganization of production and America's failure to adapt to it. This is very interesting, because really when we look historically at what has happened to our neighbour to the south, and of course to us, the changes have really taken place since the middle of the 1960s. Before the middle 1960s only a small proportion of North American goods was traded internationally. We did not have the world marketplace. That is critical, I think, to bear in mind.

In 1980, 19 per cent of the goods Americans made were exported, but more than 22 per cent of the goods that Americans used were imported. By 1980, more than 70 per cent of all the goods produced in the United States were actively competing with foreign-made goods. In other words, the United States and Canada really had become a part of a world market. It was not just a question of selling domestically and having very few exports and very few imports. The marketplace changed from a principally domestic market to a world market.

It is also interesting that by 1981 the United States was importing almost 26 per cent of its cars; 17 per cent of its steel; 60 per cent of its televisions, radios, tape recorders and phonographs; 43 per cent of its calculators; 27 per cent of its metal forming machine tools; 35 per cent of its textile machinery, and 53 per cent of its computerized machine tools. Twenty years before, imports had accounted for less than 10 per cent of the American market for each of these products.

The declining share of America in the world market has been really dramatic in regard to capital intensive, high volume industries. Since 1963, America's share of the world market has declined in a number of important areas: automobiles by almost one third; industrial machinery by 33 per cent; agricultural machinery by 40 per cent; telecommunications machinery by 50 per cent; metalworking machinery by 55 per cent.

So you can see the impact of a world marketplace, just a single, global marketplace. Very simply put, the goods are being made wherever they can be made the cheapest and it does not

matter what the political boundaries are. I would like to point out that the most efficient places for mass production are now in the Third World countries.

Mr. Stokes: You do not categorize Japan as a Third World country?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: No, I do not. In response to the query from my friend the member for Nipigon—and again I do not want to get off the track—Japan is no longer a low salary, low-wage-earning country.

As a matter of fact, by the mid-1960s, Korea, Hong Kong, Taiwan, Singapore, Brazil and Spain were specializing in simple products—clothing, footwear, toys and basic electronic assemblies—that required substantial amounts of unskilled labour but little capital investment or technology. Between 1970 and 1975, Korea's exports of textiles increased by 436 per cent, Taiwan's by 347 per cent and Hong Kong's by 191 per cent.

Again in response to my colleague from Nipigon, Japan's response was to shift out of the simple products into processing industries, such as steel and synthetic fibres, that required substantial amounts of capital investment and raw materials but used mostly unskilled and semi-skilled labour and incorporated relatively mature technologies that were not subject to major innovations.

5:40 p.m.

Put very simply, what was happening was the very low wage countries were producing in a mass way products that did not require large capital investments. They were into toys and footwear, clothing, that type of thing. Then they went from that type of production into utilizing the costly capital-intensive machinery that really could pretty well run itself. It did not take a lot of skill to produce. As a matter of fact, a lot of automation was involved, and they are very low wage countries.

Again there was an evolution, a shift from the Taiwans and the Japans, the Hong Kongs, the Singapores, a shift of that type of production, that is, the basic labour-intensive, not capital-intensive, into other countries like Malaysia and Thailand, the Philippines, Sri Lanka and India, where the wages on the average were probably no more than \$25 a month. A very interesting evolution or structural change is taking place, because here in North America, where we have the sophisticated technology and the capital-intensive, automated, mass-produced, standardized type of production we cannot

compete with the other countries in a world marketplace.

The shift that was pointed out—

Mr. Stokes: Why not? This is where robotics all got started.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: I would like to debate this on a one-to-one basis with the member for Lake Nipigon. I would be very happy to do that and to point out in a historical fashion all the components of this evolution in the change of our production, the shift, what has happened in the other countries, what countries like Japan are doing now and how we must change if we are going to compete.

For example, take Britain. Britain has consistently led the world in major technological breakthroughs. I will mention three: continuous steelcasting, monoclonal antibodies and the CAT scanner. But because British business lacked the organization and the workers lacked the skills necessary to incorporate these inventions into production processes quickly enough, the British have reaped no real competitive advantage from them. These inventions were commercialized in Japan and the United States.

The solution that has been advanced is that, in short, we have to get into more flexible systems of production. This does not mean that industrial countries must abandon their old industries such as steel, textiles and automobiles. Rather than abandoning these industries, countries are seeking to restructure them towards higher valued and technologically more sophisticated businesses, specialty steel, special chemicals, synthetic fibres and precision engineered automobiles and auto components.

I may again point out to my friend from Nipigon that of all industrialized countries, Japan has made the most rapid shift from standardized production to flexible systems production. I am not going to spend any more time in referring to that particular article because if the member would like to pick it up and read it, I think he will be suitably impressed with the structural change that has really transpired and the problems that we are going to face and are facing in this country in terms of our production.

Mr. Stokes: Did you wonder why there was only two per cent unemployment in Japan and they are concerned about it?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: I do not wish to debate on a one-on-one basis, although I will be glad to at any time in any forum with my friend from Nipigon.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Except this forum.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: I do not think it is appropriate. If the member thinks it is, I will take him on collectively or singly, whatever he likes.

Mr. Nixon: Let's have a committee, Jim.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: That is not a bad idea. I think it would be appropriate to have a select committee to examine precisely what is going on, to separate rhetoric from fact and to get a sense of direction and a sense of proportion.

There are two major challenges facing the people of this province and this government. Our most immediate and pressing task is to respond to and to manage current positive economic trends in a constructive manner. First, we must ensure that the economic recovery takes hold and then transform that momentum into positive economic growth for our province.

Effecting this transformation from a recovery mode to a new pattern of sustained and positive growth is our second and perhaps most important challenge. To successfully meet this challenge we will have to help our industries and manufacturers adapt and adjust to the world-wide reorganization of production which has occurred over the past 20 years, most notably in the past decade.

Programs such as Canada-Ontario employment development are designed to achieve a limited but important goal of helping the unemployed through a very difficult economic period. They provide short-term relief but do not offer viable long-term solutions. For those solutions we must turn to policies which will support capital formation and help improve our productivity.

Only policies designed to achieve these goals can effectively reverse the deterioration of our competitive position which threatens the long-term employment prospects of our province. If these policies are to be effective, they must be designed from a global perspective and with the dynamics of a world market in mind. That worldwide reorganization of production which I alluded to earlier has been complemented by and to a degree has caused radical shifts in the patterns of world trade.

Increasing interdependence brings new problems and new opportunities, opens new markets but also exposes us to new competition. The day is long past when we in Ontario can safely ignore the newly industrialized or the less developed countries. In many instances these nations have become aggressive exporters and are taking an increasingly large share of developed markets.

It is no secret that Canada is a trading nation and Ontario is a trading province. Export sales

in the future will be an important element in dynamic economic growth. However, Canada's share of world trade has been declining over the last 10 years. For Ontario the decline in share of world trade has been just as troubling, from four per cent in 1970 to 2.5 per cent in 1981.

5:50 p.m.

Of greatest concern to me is the fact that this country's trade deficit in manufactured goods continues to expand. This is of particular significance for Ontario, which accounts for approximately 50 per cent of Canada's manufactured exports. As I recall, that 50 per cent at one time was about 70 per cent.

As all members are aware, manufacturing accounts for more value added growth and employment than any other sector of the economy. According to Ministry of Industry and Trade figures, world trade in manufactured goods is expected to increase by four per cent to 4.5 per cent annually during the period 1983 to 1987. If Ontario producers are to win a fair share of that increase they are going to have to compete for it. Only if they compete successfully can we expect to derive any economic benefit, including a growth in employment opportunities.

In fact, over the next four to five years our producers will find that they will have to compete vigorously to maintain their share of our domestic market. Canada already experiences a higher degree of import penetration than any other Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development country. Our domestic producers' exposure to foreign competition will increase over the next few years as tariff reductions negotiated at the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade come into effect.

The result of GATT and the Bretton Woods monetary system, has been the emergence of one worldwide market. The rules in this market are clear: To survive, you must compete; to compete, you must be productive; to be productive, you must adapt. Within this new environment the government can best help the unemployed and most effectively resolve the long-term problems of unemployment by helping industries adapt and compete.

The generation of new employment opportunities depends on capital formation and the level of productivity. These two factors largely determine how many jobs there can be, how secure they can be and how well-paid they can be. If we in this House are serious about creating greater employment opportunities for Ontarians, then we should concentrate on ways to encourage capital formation and improve productivity.

The throne speech explicitly states that this government is committed to developing internationally competitive world-class industries in Ontario. I suggest that this commitment is a real commitment to increase employment. In our last budget, for example, we suspended the corporate income tax on incorporated small businesses for a two-year period. This move returned more than \$250 million to some 60,000 small firms in 1982-83. This provided the small business sector, which accounts for 40 per cent of all employment in the province, with a substantial investment pool.

This government will continue its efforts to stimulate business investment by imaginative policies that allow us to work effectively within the private sector, and members opposite will just have to wait and see how imaginative those policies are. Most important, this government has been able to sustain investor confidence in Ontario because of its record of sound, responsible management, and members cannot deny that.

Interjections.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: We have kept our deficit under control—and the member knows that—and have carefully regulated the size of the public sector—and the member knows that. As a result of our long-standing commitment to and practice of restraint we have been able to provide cost-effective, high-quality services to the people of this province—and the member knows that as well.

I am pleased to note that in the throne speech, Mr. Speaker—and I am glad you have observed this as well—the government undertakes to strengthen further the management of the province's affairs. That should receive applause from all members. I am also encouraged by the fact that in the speech from the throne the government declared its intention to address the problem of falling productivity.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Oh, come on.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: The member knows that as well.

I do not think it is an exaggeration to say that unless we quickly reverse the trend in declining productivity the problem will soon assume crisis proportions if it has not done so already. In Canada, declining productivity is a fairly universal problem but Ontario, as the manufacturing heartland, is particularly hard hit by the slump.

Some appreciation of the severity of the Canadian productivity problem can be had

from the following figures. Between 1950 and 1981, manufacturing output per man-hour worked rose 194 per cent in Canada. By comparison, during the same period output increased 267 per cent in Sweden, 350 per cent in France, 414 per cent in West Germany and a phenomenal 1,334 per cent in Japan.

From 1960 to 1980, Canadian productivity grew at an average rate of 2.4 per cent per year compared to the average rate of 3.9 per cent of all OECD countries. By 1982, Canada had the worst productivity record of any western nation and our productivity has actually declined in three of the last four years. It is important for members to take note of the facts.

More alarming from the Canadian perspective is the fact our productivity performance is rapidly being overtaken by non-OECD producers. The newly industrialized countries and less developed countries are now using much the same type of equipment as we do and have the advantage of access to cheaper resources and cheaper labour, advantages which they will continue to enjoy for quite some time in the future.

The productivity problem is a complex one and solving it will require a concerted effort on the part of labour, management and government. An element of any solution will, however, be the adoption of more efficient production technology. The government's major contribution to this effort is being made by the technology research centres. It is hoped these centres will help the private sector make the transition to the technological society. However, I would caution against believing that high technology is the open sesame to our economic future.

Ultimately, the real solutions come down, as they always do, to people. High technology requires people who are trained and equipped to operate, maintain and apply it in an efficient manner. After all, the inefficient operation of efficient technologies is not progress. Therefore, to be competitive and productive, we require an appropriately educated and skilled labour pool. The speech from the throne suggests that this government will act to provide for such a labour force.

Mr. Philip: If you had taken a speed reading course you would have saved us all a lot of time.

The Deputy Speaker: That is out of order.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: I think it is too, Mr. Speaker. I was proceeding rather quickly because I was hoping to finish my remarks by six o'clock. The subject matter with which I am dealing is very

important and vital. The members of this Legislature should have some concept, some understanding of what is happening not only in the Ontario and Canadian economy but in the North American and world economy.

The members should have some understanding as to what is happening in the financial community and the banking world, the changes taking place there and how those changes will fundamentally affect every Canadian, every Ontarian, every individual. It is important in my

estimation that the members of this Legislature take this matter seriously.

Mr. Philip: We are.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: No, the member is not, because he would rather engage in senseless repartee than involve himself in what I consider a very serious discussion.

On motion by Mr. J. A. Taylor, the debate was adjourned.

The House adjourned at 6 p.m.

CONTENTS

Monday, April 25, 1983

Statement by the ministry

McCaffrey, Hon. B., Minister of Citizenship and Culture:

Sale of science circus. 125

Oral questions

Bennett, Hon. C. F., Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing:

Ontario home renewal program funds, Mr. Epp, Mr. Wrye, Mr. Cooke. 130

Bernier, Hon. L., Minister of Northern Affairs:

Extended care bed program, Mr. T. P. Reid, Mr. Stokes. 132

McMurtry, Hon. R. R., Attorney General:

Norcen Energy Resources Ltd., Mr. Renwick, Mr. Peterson. 135

Norton, Hon. K. C., Minister of the Environment:

Niagara River water quality, Mr. Bradley. 134

Ramsay, Hon. R. H., Minister of Labour:

Closure of Consolidated-Bathurst plant, Mr. Peterson, Mr. Mackenzie, Ms. Copps. 126

Canada Packers layoffs, Mr. Rae, Mr. Sweeney. 128

Protection of workers, Mr. Mackenzie, Mr. Wrye, Mr. Rae. 130

Re-employment of former SKF employees, Mr. R. F. Johnston, Mr. Sweeney. 131

Urea formaldehyde foam insulation, Mr. Swart, Mr. Wrye. 132

Taylor, Hon. G. W., Solicitor General:

Appointment of police chief, Mr. Peterson, Mr. Renwick. 127

Timbrell, Hon. D. R., Minister of Agriculture and Food:

Ontario Stock Yards, Mr. Shymko. 133

Wells, Hon. T. L., Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs:

Constitutional accord, Mr. Peterson. 136

First readings

Employment Standards Amendment Act, Bill 19, Mr. Wrye, agreed to. 137

Yonge-Rosedale Charitable Foundation Act, Bill Pr14, Mrs. Scrivener, agreed to. 137

City of Toronto Act, Bill Pr3, Ms. Fish, agreed to. 137

Thomas-Hamilton-Webber Ltd. Act, Bill Pr11, Mr. Van Horne, agreed to. 137

Lemon-Aid Act, Bill 20, Mr. Philip, agreed to. 137

Throne speech debate

Mr. Rae. 137

Mr. J. A. Taylor. 159

Other business

Visitor, Mr. Drea. 134

Annual reports, Mr. Renwick. 137

Adjournment. 165

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Bennett, Hon. C. F., Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Ottawa South PC)
Bernier, Hon. L., Minister of Northern Affairs (Kenora PC)
Bradley, J. J. (St. Catharines L)
Cooke, D. S. (Windsor-Riverside NDP)
Copps, S. M. (Hamilton Centre L)
Cureatz, S. L., Deputy Speaker and Chairman (Durham East PC)
Di Santo, O. (Downsview NDP)
Drea, Hon. F., Minister of Community and Social Services (Scarborough Centre PC)
Epp, H. A. (Waterloo North L)
Johnston, R. F. (Scarborough West NDP)
Kolyn, A. (Lakeshore PC)
Laughren, F. (Nickel Belt NDP)
Mackenzie, R. W. (Hamilton East NDP)
McCaffrey, Hon. R. B., Minister of Citizenship and Culture (Armourdale PC)
McClellan, R. A. (Bellwoods NDP)
McMurtry, Hon. R. R., Attorney General (Eglinton PC)
Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
Norton, Hon. K. C., Minister of the Environment (Kingston and the Islands PC)
Peterson, D. R. (London Centre L)
Philip, E. T. (Etobicoke NDP)
Rae, R. K. (York South NDP)
Ramsay, Hon. R. H., Minister of Labour (Sault Ste. Marie PC)
Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L-Lab.)
Renwick, J. A. (Riverdale NDP)
Shymko, Y. R. (High Park-Swansea PC)
Stokes, J. E. (Lake Nipigon NDP)
Swart, M. L. (Welland-Thorold NDP)
Sweeney, J. (Kitchener-Wilmot L)
Taylor, Hon. G. W., Solicitor General (Simcoe Centre PC)
Taylor, J. A. (Prince Edward-Lennox PC)
Timbrell, Hon. D. R., Minister of Agriculture and Food (Don Mills PC)
Turner, Hon. J. M., Speaker (Peterborough PC)
Wells, Hon. T. L., Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Scarborough North PC)
Wrye, W. M. (Windsor-Sandwich L)



Hansard

Official Report of Debates

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Third Session, 32nd Parliament

Tuesday, April 26, 1983

Afternoon Sitting

Speaker: Honourable John M. Turner

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

Contents of the proceedings reported in this issue of Hansard appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of the speakers taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is \$15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, Information Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 965-2238.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Tuesday, April 26, 1983

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

MEMBERS' PRIVILEGES

Mr. Wrye: Mr. Speaker, my point of privilege pertains to the rights of all members of the Legislature to be able to meet with their constituents. I am speaking in this case particularly of those handicapped constituents in wheelchairs. I want to bring this matter to your attention, sir, and to the attention of the responsible ministers as a result of a visit to this building by a handicapped constituent of mine last week.

This individual, who came to the Legislature with a companion without a car and thus was not driven, pointed out there is no proper wheelchair access for a person who is not being driven to the front of the building. Those individuals, as in this case, who wish to avail themselves of the wide promenade sidewalk which runs from Queen's Park Crescent to the front of the building face two obstacles.

The first obstacle is to get on to the sidewalk from the street, because there is no ramp. The second is in getting from the sidewalk into the parking area and the assembly area directly in front of the building, because once again there is no ramp and on either side there are flower beds, so there is really no way a handicapped individual can get up from the sidewalk into that assembly area.

I would ask you, sir, and the responsible ministers to look into that problem and perhaps to put a ramp in at both ends of the promenade sidewalk so that all our constituents can use the main sidewalk when they come into the Legislature at the front entrance.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. I am sure the appropriate minister will take note of that.

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I would like to—

Mr. Foulds: Are you or aren't you?

Mr. Kerrio: Who is going to be the first to know?

Hon. Mr. Davis: You.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Are you announcing the resignation of the front bench?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I notice that until you arrived there were not many over there.

Mr. T. P. Reid: I am just here to balance them.

Hon. Mr. Davis: And I am here, so what more could you ask?

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Ah yes, but it is always quality that is more important than quantity.

Mr. T. P. Reid: That is what we have been saying for years.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I know you have been saying that for years.

Mr. Speaker: Never mind the interjections, please.

Hon. Mr. Davis: They are interrupting me, Mr. Speaker.

ONTARIO ARTS COUNCIL

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask members to join me in celebrating the 20th anniversary of one of Ontario's most innovative, successful and respected institutions, the Ontario Arts Council.

This is an organization whose reputation has spread internationally and whose methods are copied by other provinces and states far beyond our own borders. To have achieved all this in the short period of 20 years is further testament to the council, which was established in April 1963 when this Legislature unanimously passed Bill 162, giving it a unique mandate to serve a growing constituency.

I am sure every member of the House will join me in extending our congratulations to the council on its 20th anniversary and in thanking all those members of the council, numbering 42 over this period of time, who have contributed so significantly to the growth and current vigour of the arts in this province.

It is ironic and highly fortunate that the arts are one part of our society that do not measure their worth purely in economic terms. Yet the arts in Ontario can be extremely proud of their contribution not just to the quality of life of our

people but to our standard of living as well.

Today cultural industries generate \$3 billion in economic activity annually. They account for 50,000 man-years of employment and at least \$2.5 billion in tourist revenues. In fact the Stratford Festival, to take but one example, is such a powerful magnet for tourism that it is one of North America's most popular theatres.

In access to the arts and opportunities to participate in them, Ontario is second to no other jurisdiction in the world. Today this city, Metropolitan Toronto, is a major world centre of the arts. Next to New York and London it is the largest producer of live theatre in the English-speaking world. It is the third largest music production centre in North America and, with the Festival of Festivals, hosts one of the most popular film festivals anywhere.

Today Ontario's cultural superstructure includes dozens of professional theatre and dance companies, 49 symphony orchestras, hundreds of museums and libraries, nearly 100 publishers of Canadian books and another 100 Ontario publishers of Canadian magazines.

Thus it is fitting, I think, that as we pause to reflect on the accomplishments of the past 20 years we also speculate on what the next 20 years will hold for the arts and the people of this province.

In 1973 the government passed guidelines for cultural policy development that outlined the relationship it thought should exist between government and the arts. Those guidelines have served us well through the last decade of tremendous growth, and while recent years have not been easy ones for many in this province, including those involved in the arts, we are fortunate indeed that both the quality and the quantity of our artistic endeavours remain very high.

Now, on the 20th anniversary of one of the primary catalysts of the arts, it is a pleasure to reaffirm my government's commitment to continue support for the council and to say we will work to ensure the council's mandate is most effectively executed.

If the years 1983 to 2003 are as creative, healthy and successful as the past 20 years, I am confident that a good deal of the credit will go to the Ontario Arts Council.

Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to welcome many members of the council who are seated in your gallery and to thank them publicly for their efforts for these past many years.

Mr. Speaker: I am sure all members join in welcoming the members of the Ontario Arts

Council. I can only make one observation, and that is that it is a much more subdued appearance than I had expected.

FOREST MANAGEMENT AGREEMENTS

Hon. Mr. Pope: Mr. Speaker, today I would like to bring the House up to date on my ministry's progress in forest management agreements.

I know that honourable members recognize the economic significance of forestry to our province. Forest management agreements, or FMAs, are a major factor in achieving Ontario's long-range objective of ensuring regeneration to guarantee that this contribution to our provincial economy continues.

2:10 p.m.

Under these FMAs, which replace existing timber licences, forestry companies agree to accept the responsibility for all forest management practices, including harvesting, regeneration, tending and road construction. My ministry, with assistance from the Board of Industrial Leadership and Development, provides subsidies for forest access roads and funding for silvicultural work.

The companies also carefully consider the interests of other forest users, working with my ministry to set aside areas that cannot be cut, areas important for activities such as hunting, fishing, canoeing, camping and wildlife habitat. They also protect these values through controlled cutting techniques.

In the last two months, I have signed five new FMAs with four companies. I signed an agreement with Ontario Paper Company Ltd. for the Nagagami Forest near Hearst and another with E. B. Eddy Forest Products Ltd. for the Pineland Forest near Timmins. I signed two agreements with Boise Cascade Canada Ltd. for the Seine River Forest near Atikokan and the Manitou Forest near Fort Frances.

The agreement I signed with Waferboard Corporation Ltd. for the Romeo Malette Forest in Timmins has particular significance because it is the first agreement made with a company not involved in pulp and paper production. As such, it shows my ministry, and the Ontario government, is sincerely interested in involving as much of the forestry industry as possible in the management of our forests. It is just one way we are acknowledging the industry's expertise in forest management.

Our agreement with Waferboard also shows that forest management agreements are not exclusively for larger corporations. This is just

the beginning of our efforts to involve smaller but just as important operators in the FMA process.

I am sure the honourable members know that small independent operators hold licences in many areas of our province, licences that are not large enough to ensure a supply of timber on a sustained yield basis. We are proposing that these independents consider establishing a forest co-operative to manage the forest in their areas.

This would allow them to enter into their own FMA so they can manage the forest in all its aspects, from harvesting the timber and directing it to a mill that needs it, to reforestation. Should these efforts prove successful, and I am confident they will, I would look upon them as another breakthrough in the management of our province's forest resources.

Since 1979 we have signed 13 FMAs covering an area of more than 64,000 square kilometres. My ministry, with the help of BILD, will spend some \$35 million this year alone on the agreements.

FMAs have a valuable side effect. They protect forestry jobs of the future and they directly create jobs. In addition, FMAs are creating a demand for planting stock that we have not experienced before. We have enlisted the help of private industry to keep up with this demand for seedlings caused by new FMAs.

By 1985, we hope to have 30 FMAs in place, covering more than 70 per cent of the forestry operations on currently licensed crown land in Ontario. My ministry's involvement by that time will be well in excess of \$100 million annually. This represents 60 per cent of the total cost of the FMAs; the rest comes from industry.

Last year, FMA holders regenerated more than 11,000 hectares of forest land at a cost of \$4.2 million. The holders carried out further silvicultural activities on another 29,000 hectares and constructed more than 600 kilometres of forest access roads. These roads, which cost \$11.3 million, are also used by the public generally and provide access to areas for harvesting overmature forests, regeneration and silvicultural work.

These FMAs and those yet to be signed map our transition from the harvesting of a natural forest to intensive management of the forest to produce crops on a sustained yield basis. They ensure that our forests will maintain the current forest industry base and also provide, over the longer term, for growth and development of our forest-based communities.

As the honourable members can see, the private sector and my ministry are doing much to ensure that Ontario's forest industry remains strong and prosperous well into the future.

ORAL QUESTIONS

BUY CANADIAN PROGRAM

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour. It is my understanding the Ontario Manpower Commission recently purchased a computer from an American manufacturer, Altos Computer Systems of San Jose, California. Even though the purchase price was less than \$100,000—in the minister's terms that amount is probably not significant—there seems to be an important principle involved in that case, particularly while the minister's colleagues are promoting the shop Canadian program wherever they can. I understand even the Premier (Mr. Davis) believes in it.

Why was this machine purchased in the United States? Were tenders let for this contract in Canada? Were Canadian companies given the opportunity of bidding on this contract?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, I will have to take that question under advisement. I will report back to the House on Thursday of this week.

Mr. Peterson: When the minister is reporting back to this House, would he table the specifications, the bids received and the analyses of those bids made by his ministry before the purchase of that particular equipment, which has had some technical problems and has not been performing? Would he table all the specifications, the bids and all the relevant documentation so we can assure those Canadian manufacturers who maintain, to us at least, that they could have done it better for 25 per cent cheaper, that they were not shortchanged in the selection of that machinery?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: I am confident I can provide all the information the honourable member is requesting.

OHIP PREMIUMS

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller), I have a question for the Premier.

[Interruption]

Mr. Peterson: There is a delegate up there for him. Does the Premier want to go up and shake hands?

Hon. Mr. Davis: He or she will be a voter.

Mr. Peterson: She is in pink. She looks a little too smart for him to me, to be perfectly honest.

I am sure the Premier is aware of a great number of things, obviously, but he is aware that the Treasurer has been conducting some prebudget meetings with a variety of groups across this province.

He may or may not be aware that the Ontario School Trustees' Council bulletin, which I understand came out today, made the following report of that meeting with the Treasurer. I am only quoting excerpts. It said: "OHIP premiums may be increased by as much as 15 to 20 per cent. The province is considering extending the current Inflation Restraint Act beyond the current nine and five, two-year period."

Could the Premier kindly inform this House if the Treasurer is contemplating those options? Is the government going to proceed with those options, particularly in view of the fact that the option with respect to Ontario health insurance plan premiums is clearly against the law and its own act as it is currently written?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I will not get into a debate with the Leader of the Opposition as to whether or not it is contrary to the law; that is a subject for another occasion.

I have not been present with any of the groups at the Treasurer's prebudget meetings. I can only assume the discussion is fairly wide ranging. No commitments are given to any group the Treasurer meets with, obviously, because he has not made any determinations.

While today is April 26, I think I can tell the honourable member that probably on a number of issues the Treasurer is still reaching a final conclusion. I cannot help him beyond that except to assure him, as I would on any occasion, that the Treasurer's budget, when it is presented, will be logical, intelligent, sensitive and in keeping with the economic conditions of this province and our financial obligations, as has been the case in every budget that I have been witness to.

Mr. Peterson: I want to refer the Premier to the legal opinion tabled in this House by the Treasurer and Minister of Economics with respect to the legality of the last OHIP premium increase. This is under the minister's signature. He said:

"The opinion of the legal staff of my ministry is that future increases in OHIP premiums are subject to part III, i.e. administered prices of the bill"—so they are an administered price—"if they take place within the period mentioned in

part III, that is, in most cases between September 21, 1982, and January 1, 1984."

2:20 p.m.

That being said, it is the ministry's opinion that the OHIP premiums are an administered price and that any attempt to increase those in the operative period would be in contravention of the act, unless, of course, the minister goes to cabinet to get special dispensation to increase those prices.

Can we have the Premier's categorical assurance as the first minister that he will not run around the act, that he will not go and seek an OHIP premium increase in excess of five per cent, and that when thousands of people in this province are restraining themselves, the government will restrain itself?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would venture to offer a point of view to the Leader of the Opposition that he might exercise a certain measure of moderation and restraint himself in some of his observations; but that would be asking a great deal, and I would never presume to give that advice.

If the Leader of the Opposition understands the statutes, as his researchers have prepared his material for him and he understands very clearly what the process is, this government is not intending to get around the legislation.

But it is also important to point out without any reference specifically to OHIP that the legislation was specifically drafted so that with respect to some administered prices, if in fact the actual cost—or the pass-through, whatever term you may wish to use—is in excess of the five per cent, that principle has been established in the statute.

Mr. McClellan: Mr. Speaker, I really do not understand why the leader of the Liberal Party wants another \$32 increase in the family rate, which is already the highest in Canada. If the Premier does not understand it, there is already a mountain of evidence indicating that our premiums are so high in Ontario that there are tens of thousands of citizens who cannot afford and do not have coverage.

Instead of a five per cent increase, as the Leader of the Opposition is suggesting, or a 15 per cent increase, which the Treasurer is brooding about, would the Premier not agree that it would be much wiser to replace the premium assistance program entirely with a tax credit and, second, begin to shift the burden of paying for health care from the regressive premiums to progressive income and corporation taxes?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think it is perhaps proper to engage members of the House in this discussion at the time of the budget. We have debated on a number of occasions whether there are in fact better alternatives. The member opposite has a philosophical point of view that the government has not accepted. I think his party has explored the payroll tax as an alternative, if memory serves me correctly, and there are—

Mr. McClellan: It was your idea.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Listen, I am just saying that the member's party has also explored it, and there are some negatives with respect to that, as I understand it.

I also really wish the honourable member understood that when it comes to the payment of premiums, the premiums do take into account the capacity of some sectors of our society to pay. With respect, I wish he would document those thousands of people who cannot afford to pay a premium.

Mr. Conway: Mr. Speaker, since the Premier will not give the people of Ontario his categorical assurance that OHIP premiums will not rise on the order of 15 to 20 per cent, as predicted in the document read by the Leader of the Opposition, does the Premier, as the architect of this restraint program, not feel it to be hypocritical in the extreme to ask people by the tens of thousands to restrain their wage demands to the five per cent limit, while at the same dishing up for the second year running a double-digit premium increase of the kind mentioned in the document referred to by the Leader of the Opposition?

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member for Renfrew North should not get carried away and excited. It has been my experience before budgets that figures are mentioned and so on. I cannot give a guarantee as to what the budget is going to contain. Some members opposite would then accuse me of leaking some of the information. I can only assure the honourable member that the Treasurer of this province—

Interjection.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, the members of the Liberal Party know all about leaks of that nature.

Why not be patient and wait until the Treasurer's budget is presented? The member is aware of the sensitivity, the concern and the problems imposed by the economic conditions and also by the restraint program. But if he goes back to many of the things his leader said when

he was the financial critic for his party, the number of occasions he berated the Treasurer because his incomes did not come close to matching the revenues and said we should balance the books, not have any deficits, if he would look at some of that material, he might then remind his leader of some of the things he said before his reincarnation.

LEAD ASSESSMENTS AT WILCO-CANADA

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, my question is of the Minister of Labour. It concerns an issue that has been being raised in this House since April 1982, and that is the question of lead poisoning of many workers at Wilco-Canada Inc. in London.

I would like to ask the minister how he explains the appropriateness of six charges being laid against workers in that plant for "not using respirator equipment provided by the employer on November 23, 24 or 29," when at precisely the same time the government was laying charges against two supervisors, as well as against the company, for failing to give workers appropriate respiratory equipment for the type and concentration of airborne lead.

How does he explain the fairness of punishing workers for failing to wear equipment, when at the very same time ministry inspectors are clearly saying to the company that the equipment they are giving to these workers is completely inadequate? Is he blaming workers for taking the same steps as his inspectors have taken?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, with respect, the honourable leader of the third party is talking out of both sides of his mouth at the same time.

I have been criticized in this Legislature by members of the third party for not acting in respect to the Wilco situation. When they said they were well aware of the fact we had closed that plant down on one occasion to get it to comply with the regulations and to put in the correct control procedures. They continually recommended to me that I go further than that, or what they considered to be further than that—I thought closure was the ultimate position to reach—nevertheless, to prosecute the company and all those involved in the improper compliance with the regulations.

Our inspectors went in there and did a thorough job. Our legal branch agonized over all the information that had been received for some time. There was considerable consultation by all our senior officials to make sure we

were on solid ground in every respect. The end result has been the charges that have been laid. Those charges are laid, and I think it would be inappropriate for me to comment any further now than that they are before the courts.

Mr. Rae: Not one of the charges relates to the company's failure to clean up its act and to provide decent ventilation and to get lead right out of the environment at Wilco. Not a single one of those charges relates to that problem.

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister about a particular individual whose name is Larry Grafstein who worked at Wilco for 12 weeks only between June and September 1982. If the minister's department has been on top of this issue for so long, how can he explain the fact that, after working at this plant for only 12 weeks, Mr. Grafstein in 1982 was monitored as having lead levels well over 1.00 milligrams per litre?

He was subsequently put on workers' compensation benefits, and as recently as February 1983 his blood levels shot up to 1.90 milligrams per litre. He spent three weeks in hospital. He almost died. Because the blood was having difficulty passing the lead, they had to switch the drugs they were using on him. Since then he has spent the majority of time in hospital for chelating treatments. It takes about five days in hospital for him to recover from the weekly four-hour treatments.

I would like to ask the minister, if the ministry has been on top of this issue, as he is so proud in saying, how can he explain the fact that this worker is suffering from lead poisoning to the extent that he practically died and has spent the last three weeks in hospital? How does the minister explain the condition of this worker if his ministry has been on top of this situation?

2:30 p.m.

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: I am aware of the particular case history that the member is reading out in the Legislature today. I do not want to minimize it in any way, shape or form, because it is a very serious matter, but the information I have had certainly does not indicate the same gravity of a problem. I will be happy to follow it up and look into it again, but my information certainly has not coincided with the information the member has brought forward.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, on February 9 I asked the minister the whether he was aware of the following facts.

Mr. Mohsir Najjar, a five-year worker in the

shipping department at Wilco, was told in January that he would have to do his own job plus drive a forklift. When Mohsir offered medical evidence that his respiratory problems precluded his being exposed to lead he was laid off.

In the case of Brad Tunks, a young tube mill assistant, he was literally poisoned from exposure to lead at Wilco and suffered nerve damage.

In the case of Dan Wood, who had his blood lead level checked in September 1982, Wilco management would not provide him with the blood lead level tests. However, he was removed from the tube mill and later laid off.

I also asked whether the minister was aware that four workers who were on compensation were laid off immediately on being told they could resume work.

Finally, I asked if he was aware that Wilco still had not implemented the ventilation program that was laid down.

In a subsequent letter, the minister refused to answer those questions and he has not answered them yet. When is he going to lay charges on the real gut issue, the failure to clean the place up?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, I did respond to the letter the honourable member raised in the House. Mind you, I did not give him the information he requested, simply because charges have been laid and the case is now before the courts.

NURSING HOME CARE

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Health (Mr. Grossman), I would like to address a question to the Provincial Secretary for Social Development. It has to do with the government's intentions with respect to nursing homes.

Is the minister satisfied that the one and a half hours per day of nursing care provided for in the regulations for extended care residents in Ontario's nursing homes is an adequate standard of care in Ontario? If she is, how can she explain the kinds of problems and complaints and concerns that I raised yesterday?

I know the minister was here for much of the speech yesterday with respect to several nursing homes, including the River Glen Haven Nursing Home, the Tender Loving Care Nursing Home, the Lincoln Place Nursing Home and several other nursing homes. How can she explain the inadequacy of staffing and the staffing problems that have been revealed time and time again?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member will know the Minister of Health

has already indicated that he has several concerns within the nursing home area and that he is addressing those concerns. He is improving the inspection. He is certainly communicating to the nursing homes that we will not tolerate care that is not at the level we expect nursing homes to provide to those who require their services.

I know that even with the best of programs and the best of intentions there are still occasions when circumstances develop that we certainly do not approve of, but the minister has indicated he will not tolerate anyone in any nursing home within this province not receiving adequate care.

As to the one and a half hours' nursing care, that is a policy we are addressing at the moment.

Mr. Rae: I ask the minister again, if she is so satisfied with the inspection process and with its adequacy, can she explain how it is possible that Mr. Gould, who is the current manager of nursing home services, was quoted as saying at a meeting on April 11, 1983: "Our staff are being run off their feet. A lot of pressure is on"? Does she think it is appropriate to have staff being run off their feet and to have a mere 14 inspectors with respect to nursing care for 340 nursing homes in Ontario? Is she satisfied that the inspection staff is there to do the job that needs to be done?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I do not think I indicated I was satisfied at all. I said the minister was aware and concerned about inspection of nursing homes where there have been complaints. It is an issue he is addressing. I at no time indicated I was completely satisfied with the inspection that was taking place.

Ms. Copps: Mr. Speaker, has the provincial secretary, in her role as superminister, been involved with the Minister of Health in discussions that will lead up to the tabling of legislation which he has already promised for this session?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Mr. Speaker, through you to the member, yes.

Mr. Rae: In conclusion, can the minister explain to us how it is possible that in the last very few years complaint after complaint has been registered with respect to individual nursing homes with respect to the problem of staffing, with respect to the problem of enforcement of existing standards, with respect to the problem of fire hazards and with respect to the problem of adequate programs for residents of these nursing homes, that time and time again

the government has been made aware of these problems and to date absolutely nothing has been done in terms of changes in the act or changes in the regulations or changes in basic procedures being followed by the inspection service?

Can she explain why it has taken all this time, coroner's verdict after coroner's verdict, complaint after complaint, and to date absolutely nothing has been done?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I take exception to the member's comments when he suggests nothing has been done. A great deal has been done and I am still not satisfied that enough is being done. Those questions are all being addressed by the Minister of Health.

Mr. Speaker: Before proceeding, may I ask the co-operation of all members in limiting their private conversations please.

EMPLOYMENT OF HANDICAPPED PERSONS

Mr. Wrye: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour dealing with the problems of the handicapped community in finding any employment. I know it is a subject which the minister is deeply concerned about, because just last week he attended a conference in his home riding regarding the employment of handicapped persons.

I would like to remind the minister that in January 1982 the Ontario Manpower Commission released a report which disclosed the rate of unemployment among the employably handicapped was just under 30 per cent. According to the handicapped employment program in his own ministry, the true figures are more than double that rate.

In Sault Ste. Marie, as the minister knows, and in my own community of Windsor, it is estimated that 80 per cent of the employable handicapped are without work. Here in Toronto the estimated figure is 75 per cent and the list goes on and on throughout the province.

The Pigott task force completed its work and submitted its report to the minister about a month ago. Will he tell us today when we can expect from the government a comprehensive strategy on employment initiatives for the handicapped? Will he tell us why there was no mention of this subject in the speech from the throne?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, I am delighted the member has brought up the conference that was held in Sault Ste. Marie because I was told

by my officials that it was by far the largest conference held anywhere in the province, with over 200 participants. It was also the best conference ever held in the province. I had the opportunity to tell them I was not surprised at all because that sort of circumstance happens all the time in Sault Ste. Marie, regardless of what the issue may be.

In fact, with the greatest respect to those who reside in Toronto, I was told by my officials that they could never hope to attract as many as 200 people to a conference on the handicapped here in Toronto. It was reassuring to have such a good turnout in Sault Ste. Marie.

To answer my friend opposite, as far as the Pigott task force report is concerned, I have not yet received a copy of that report. I am anticipating it shortly. I am looking forward to receiving it because I know Mrs. Pigott has done just a gruelling and complete exhaustive study of the whole matter. She was totally dedicated to the task she had and very enthusiastic about it.

I would also like to report to the member that the affirmative action programs that have been introduced by my ministry are starting to pay dividends, even despite the recessionary times.

2:40 p.m.

We now have some case histories for some major companies that have made great strides forward. I would be delighted to share those with the honourable member or with anyone else. There are companies in this province that have hired the handicapped and they have done studies of the work of the handicapped. They have found that their work habits, in just about every category one could pick, when compared with a person who is not disabled, usually come out on top.

In other words, the old myth that hiring the handicapped is hiring problems has been completely dispelled. The handicapped are demonstrating and proving that they can do a job and do it better in most instances than a person who is not handicapped.

Mr. Wrye: To go back again to that huge number who do not have a job and the lack of initiative from the ministry in rectifying that problem, during the estimates last January the minister stated, "There is no hesitation at all on my part as far as the priority of the handicapped employment program is concerned."

If there is such a priority, the handicapped employment program is not even an official program; it is a developmental initiative con-

stantly under review without the status and protection of an independent ministerial program. This program has a staff of seven workers and one secretary. The entire budget of this so-called program is \$600,000 and that budget for 1983-84 has been cut 13 per cent from last year.

How can the minister pretend that this kind of staff and funding represents any serious commitment to rectify the disgraceful state of affairs where four out of every five employable handicapped people in his community, in mine and in so many others across this province cannot get a job?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: There is no doubt about the priority but there is doubt about the funding. I am not alone in that respect. Every minister here has had to tune in with the times and tighten our belts as far as our operations are concerned.

I would like to have additional people in my women's bureau. I would like to have additional employment standards officers. I would like to have additional people in various areas, but we have to realize that the resources are just not there and try to do the very best we can with the resources we have.

I maintain we have done that and we have shown improvement over the years in handicapped employment and we will continue to do so. We have some extremely dedicated and competent people. All seven that the member mentioned fit into that category, entirely dedicated. I repeat myself in saying that despite the recessionary times, with the co-operation of industry, we have been making strides.

Mr. Mackenzie: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister could file with the House information as to the numbers of unemployed handicapped. Is it as high as 75 and 80 per cent?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, I will not say that I will be happy to do that, because when we look at the figures in that perspective they are not good. The point I was making was that progress is being made and there is improvement, but we are starting from a pretty disastrous figure. The figure of 75 per cent mentioned is probably closer to 80, and that is a totally unacceptable figure, I fully agree.

LUMBER MILL AT ALBAN

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Natural Resources regarding Martin Lumber.

Last fall the minister said his government

took the position of processing resources at source. Since the federal government has indicated its willingness to put industry and labour adjustment program funds into a new mill in Alban to provide jobs for the over 100 workers who are currently unemployed, can the minister indicate to the House what action he intends to take to ensure that the funds which are available for only one year from the federal government will be made available so that the mill will be constructed this year?

Hon. Mr. Pope: Mr. Speaker, I presumed the member for Sudbury East would rise in his place to congratulate this government on the announcement of the allocation of surplus wood north of his community, his great riding, for the purposes of the construction of a new waferboard plant that will create in excess of 400 jobs for the Sudbury community; all of which would process wood at source, would it not?

Mr. Speaker: Now to the question please.

Hon. Mr. Pope: That is precisely the point of the announcement that was made last Friday. I have indicated to the member previously, in writing and also verbally, that when we were looking at the Rogerson's limits and what should be done with them and the Alban mill, we allocated the transfer of the licences and we allocated the wood on certain conditions that were expressly stated in the transfer documents. I think the member is aware of them. They were that by May 1 of this year Mr. Martin was to indicate to us in writing whether he was going to refurbish the existing mill.

The member is aware of the problems or purported problems of that existing mill with respect to the environmental problems associated with the waste. He is aware of the problems or purported problems with respect to electrical supply, and the problems of efficiency of operation of the mill and the cost of operation.

If Mr. Martin were to give us an indication in writing by May 1 of this year of either the construction of a new mill in the Alban area or of the refurbishing or reconstruction of the existing mill, we are awaiting that advice in writing. He is aware that before he processes that wood in anything other than the Alban mill he must obtain the written consent of me, as Minister of Natural Resources. No such consent has been asked for and no such consent has been given.

Mr. Martel: I know all that, except I also know that Mr. Martin can come back to the minister again in September and ask for a

further extension. We will have the process of logs leaving the Sudbury area, going down the Mattawa to be processed while 100 workers are out of work in the Alban area. That is the only employer. The minister will recall the throne speech last week said the government was going to look after one-industry towns.

Let me ask the minister what action he intends to take to ensure that mill is constructed, and is there a possibility of using the existing mill until plans are completed for a new mill, which would then see employment take place in yet another one-industry town in the north?

Hon. Mr. Pope: For one thing, I believe the honourable member is well aware that for any operation in that mill we would not get permission to turn on the hydroelectric power. The member is aware why that is. We would not get permission from the Ministry of the Environment for the disposal of waste in that particular site. Alternative sites would have to be found, and the member is aware why.

All I can say is I am as anxious as he is to have a new or refurbished mill located in the Alban area using that licence and the allocated timber within those licences. The member has a choice. We want a new, modern, efficient and competitive mill in that area which will give long-term job security. We are willing to give Mr. Martin a little bit of time to get his studies done, to get his applications and approvals through the federal government in order, and to give us an indication whether he is going to spend his money on refurbishing that mill to make it more competitive and more efficient or whether he is going to build a new mill.

The only alternative is to close it. If that is the alternative the member wants for the people of Alban, I am not prepared to accept it. The member cannot tell us we have had no concern about one-industry towns when we have had waferboard plants in the member's own riding, when we have had a waferboard plant in Englehart, and when we have had private nursery operations in many small communities throughout the north as a result of this government's policy on forest management.

DEATH OF JOSEPH MUGLIA

Mr. Kennedy: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney General with respect to the murder of Joseph Muglia in Mississauga last June, where there was a conviction for manslaughter and the sentence was only 21 months. Is the Attorney General's office reviewing this case and will there be an appeal of that sentence?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is a matter that was of some concern to us and an appeal as to the sentence has been launched in that case. The sentence that was handed down by the trial judge, in our respectful view, is simply inappropriate.

2:50 p.m.

Mr. Kennedy: On the same incident, there were two other arrests made and one news article as of two or three weeks ago said there had not yet been a date set for trial of the other two persons accused in this incident. Could the Attorney General comment on that, please?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: No, I am sorry; I do not know anything about the trial dates for the other accused, but I will obtain that information and advise the member accordingly.

HOSPITAL BEDS

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, since the Minister of Health is absent I will ask a question of the Minister of Health's boss, the Provincial Secretary for Social Development. She is obviously aware—if she is not, she just has to lean over and talk to the member for Ottawa South (Mr. Bennett)—that unfortunately Ottawa and Carleton have had a long history of shortage of active care beds.

I am sure she is aware that recently a 54-year-old Ottawa lady died while waiting to be admitted to the cardiac unit of the Ottawa Civic Hospital. I quote from Dr. Keon, who is one of the top heart specialists in the country. He said very simply: "But in this case, there is just no excuse. She waited seven days and if we had got her a few days before, even four or five hours before, she probably would be alive today."

In another situation in which a lady from Vanier died last October, a coroner's jury just last Friday recommended that "the Ottawa and district health council and all area hospitals review the serious shortage of available beds."

Given this very unfortunate evidence, how long will it be before the government proceeds to give sufficient funds to Ottawa-Carleton so they can have the normal provincial ratio of active care beds like every other area of the province and prevent such unfortunate situations as I have mentioned here?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the cardiac beds are being supplied some time this fall. Of course those are very unfortunate circumstances, and one hopes that we will not be faced with those kinds of situations in the future. As I understand it, there

are beds to be open in September that would address those particular issues.

Mr. Roy: The member for Ottawa South, who suggested the answer to the minister, is quite right. There will be the opening of 30 active care beds for the cardiac unit in September—

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Additional.

Mr. Roy: Additional, yes, but does the minister realize that for Ottawa-Carleton there is currently a shortage of 175 active care beds? The provincial ratio is something like 3.5 per 1,000, whereas in Ottawa-Carleton it is something like 3.2 per 1,000. Given this situation, when can we expect that the government will move to give adequate funding so that we can have the provincial average and thereby prevent situations such as these?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I can only say to the honourable member that the Minister of Health is moving as quickly as possible to make sure that all areas of the province are adequately served.

EQUAL PAY

Ms. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Labour. He seems very popular these days. I know the minister is aware of the Beverley Billing case, where a woman employee of an optical lab was denied a claim for the same pay as a male employee who was doing similar work on the ground that the male employee had additional but unused qualifications. This decision was the result of judicial review of a referee's decision and leave to appeal the court decision has been denied.

Since the minister has expressed his disappointment with the court's decision in a letter to my colleague the member for Hamilton East (Mr. Mackenzie) will he make a commitment to amend subsection 33(1)(d) of the Employment Standards Act to declare that consideration of unused qualifications is not an acceptable reason for a differential in pay between men and women doing substantially the same work?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, we have looked into that matter. It is correct that the member for Hamilton East wrote to me on April 18 and I responded to him. Following our investigations, we do not feel that an amendment to the act is required. We felt this was a particular instance and that the section of the act would appropriately cover other circumstances of a similar nature.

Ms. Bryden: Is the minister aware that Beverley Billing was led to lay her complaint after seeing the government's equal pay ads, which

appeared on buses and television just before the 1981 election and which claimed that the present equal pay legislation guaranteed women equal pay for, and I quote, "doing substantially the same work as a man," as long as the skill, effort, responsibility and working conditions required are similar?

Beverley Billing has found, by bitter experience, that the ministry's ads were misleading and that we do not have equal value legislation in effect in Ontario. Will the minister concede that Beverley Billing would probably not have been denied the same pay as her male co-worker, who was doing substantially the same work, if the principle of equal pay for work of equal value was embodied in the Ontario law, as has been done at the federal level and in Quebec and as was embodied in a bill that my former colleague Mr. Bounsall introduced in 1979 and which passed second reading in this House?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: I believe my ministry acted very responsibly in this matter. We were disappointed with the decision of the Divisional Court and accordingly we instructed our counsel to seek leave of the Court of Appeal to appeal the judgement of the Divisional Court. The Court of Appeal did not find cause to do so. While we did not agree with the decision, nevertheless we have to abide by that decision.

I am repeating myself, but I really do not feel that the legislation, as it stands, requires amendment. I feel we certainly do have strong legislation and that has been proven in many instances. This is one case that went the other way, but we can provide information to the members about other decisions that have been reached that have had far-reaching implications, not necessarily just in single applications but in multiple applications. A couple of very recent ones represented a substantial amount of money. There has been a lot of money awarded on equal pay decisions over the past two years.

Mr. Wrye: Mr. Speaker, is the minister saying we are going to get no amendments to the act and there is going to be no new legislation in this area at all? I know in estimates he rejected equal pay for work of equal value. He indicated, however, that he was going to bring in legislation adopting the composite approach. Is that now out the window as well, or are we going to see some amendments one of these days?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Mackenzie: He is saying there is no justice for Beverley Billing.

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Oh, that is ridiculous.

Mr. Mackenzie: That is exactly what you are saying.

Mr. Speaker: Never mind the interjections, please.

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: As far as the member referring to the composite test is concerned, we have every intention of bringing that forward. We have not changed our position on that at all.

COMPLAINTS AGAINST METROPOLITAN TORONTO POLICE

Mr. Shymko: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address my question to the Solicitor General. I would like to ask if—

Mr. McClellan: Red herrings.

Mr. Shymko: That seems to be the fate the member gets caught with very often.

Mr. Speaker: Never mind the interjections, please.

Mr. Shymko: I would like to ask the Solicitor General whether he is aware of the allegations that were officially submitted to the mayor of the city of Toronto that seven demonstrators who took part in the demonstration on Saturday afternoon, April 23, in front of Queen's Park were severely and brutally beaten by members of the Metropolitan Toronto Police 52 division.

There were three testimonies of choking, kicking, using of a metal pipe—three of them fainted—punching and some beatings extending from five to 10 minutes. These allegations are apparently very serious. Could he provide some advice as to what recourse these people have for a full inquiry into the actions of the Metropolitan Toronto Police?

3 p.m.

Hon. G. W. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, I thank the honourable member for the question, and I must confess to him that I have no knowledge of those allegations as so made. If those allegations have been made and somebody wants them to be investigated, there has been set up in the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto, where the demonstrations took place—and I assume the allegations are being made against members of the Metropolitan Toronto Police—a complaints commissioner, who hears those complaints and can have a hearing into the matter.

I must add that this legislation is provided for and is under the jurisdiction of the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry), and the member may want to ask him further questions on the matter. Thus, if he wants to have it redirected, he might have it redirected to the Attorney General, who

would answer more fully. But I think the available jurisdiction and benefit to those people who are making allegations happens to be there in legislation under the complaints commissioner.

Mr. Shymko: Since these details will be provided to the Solicitor General, I would like to know whether the Solicitor General would be prepared to provide details to this House, since tomorrow is the anniversary of the Vietnamese boat people and the seven individuals involved were boat people refugees. The concern they have is one of shock as to the treatment they have received from the Metropolitan Toronto Police.

Would the minister be prepared, if they do provide him this information—I believe it is on its way to him—to give some of these details to this House?

Hon. G. W. Taylor: As I have mentioned, the legislation is not under my jurisdiction; but if I receive such content I will refer it to the complaints commissioner, as would be the normal practice under the legislation.

FISHING POLICY

Mr. T. P. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Natural Resources in regard to fishing policy, or the lack thereof, in Ontario. Can the minister tell the House when he is going to make a policy statement on fishing in Ontario, specifically in regard to the most sought-after game fish in the province, walleye, or yellow pickerel? In particular, what is he going to be do about the declining stocks in all the lakes in Ontario, from Lake Nipissing to Rainy Lake and all over?

Hon. Mr. Pope: Mr. Speaker, I agree with the honourable member that in some specific locations in Ontario the walleye, or pickerel, population is under some stress and that in the past there has been some habitat deterioration for a number of reasons. But using section 38 and using some of the other existing programs of the Ministry of Natural Resources, in the past year quite a considerable sum of money and effort has been expended both to improve the habitat and to remove some of the sources of stress.

The member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Laughren) laughs at that, but about 1,200 laid-off workers in Ontario have been employed directly under section 38 in fish habitat rehabilitation work in different parts of the province doing very important work, and they have added well in excess of \$4 million as the value of work done to rehabili-

tate the pickerel fishery. Furthermore, we have undertaken in existing ministry programs an additional \$1 million worth of work in habitat rehabilitation.

The effects of this are not going to be immediate. There is going to be some period of time in some specific lakes where there are going to be some signs of deterioration, but in the long term that is the only successful way in which we are to restore the pickerel fishery in Ontario. We are committed to it and we are working hard at it as a ministry.

We are also looking at a couple of pilot projects with respect to pickerel in Ontario that involve some potential hatchery projects. We are looking at it in conjunction with the Northern Ontario Tourist Outfitters Association and the Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters. We intend to continue to work with them, looking at what is being done with pilot projects in other jurisdictions, and we hope, therefore, to make some progress.

Mr. Martel: Where have you been for 40 years?

Hon. Mr. Pope: Where have I been for 40 years?

Mr. Speaker: That was a very complete answer. Never mind the interjection.

Mr. T. P. Reid: The minister mentioned the possibility of a pickerel hatchery, which hardly any biologists in his ministry have recommended. The minister has indicated that he might put one in Lake Nipissing and perhaps somewhere in Rainy Lake or Lake of the Woods. Could he indicate whether he is talking about actual hatcheries or pond rearing for walleyes? When can we expect some kind of definitive statement on walleye fishing in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Pope: I think there has been quite a debate in the fish biologists' community in this country and in North America about the value of pickerel rearing ponds and pickerel hatcheries, and whether the survival rate in their natural habitat once they are stocked is adequate to warrant the expenditure. It is a very controversial issue. There are other strongly held points of view on the other side of the issue.

I indicated I would make my officials available, my biologists available and the Ministry of Natural Resources available to go into the midwestern states with the Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters and NOTOA representatives to look at some of the projects that are going on there now on an experimental basis and see whether we can adapt some of those to

the Ontario situation. I am willing to have an open mind on the issue and to work with the groups who want to get involved.

I have to say that under our community fisheries involvement program we have opened the way for fishing clubs and other interested and concerned groups in Ontario to initiate some of these projects for themselves. We are willing to work with them. The only conditions we put on is that there has to be some biological control to prevent the spread of disease and that once the fish hit the water they are a public resource to be available to all under our regular allocation systems.

We are willing to work with any group in Ontario which wants to expand on these activities, including those in the pickerel field, to make sure this happens. We are willing to commit our resources to some additional pickerel habitat rehabilitation programs and stocking programs in the near future.

One last point: I extend my apologies to the member for Nickel Belt.

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Speaker, given the fact that the strategic planning for Ontario fisheries program has been floating around in the ministry for several years now, and given the fact that the pickerel fishery specifically is so important to the tourist industry right across Ontario, how much in actual funding is the minister prepared to make from his own resources, and through the Board of Industrial Leadership and Development, to make it the kind of potential that it could be, not only to the tourist industry but also to sports fishermen right across the province?

Hon. Mr. Pope: Mr. Speaker, I think I should say very clearly that we believe natural reproduction and maintenance of the natural habitat is the only important way in the long term to ensure the continuation of a strong pickerel resource in Ontario. We are not prepared to stand by and see the degradation of the habitat. We are not prepared to stand by and see uncontrolled exploitation of the resource and think that the only solution is to build hatcheries and keep on pouring fish into it.

That is why in the past year, under the BILD commitments of this government and under our accelerated capital program, we have increased our expenditures on the fishery resource of this province from \$24 million to \$36 million. That is why at present we have in place capital expenditures that will increase our stocking capacities in this province by 50 per cent.

We have indicated that the existence of pickerel hatcheries as the answer is controver-

sial. We are trying to work out a mutual solution with other interest groups. When that solution is agreed upon we will put the same kind of financial commitment into that very important fishery in the province.

AMBASSADOR BUILDING MAINTENANCE LTD.

Mr. Cooke: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Labour. It concerns a company in the city of Windsor called Ambassador Building Maintenance Ltd., about which I think he has had some correspondence from my office.

Has the minister had a chance to review the situation? Does he think it is proper for a company to hire employees, making it a condition of employment that they must move into the buildings of which the company is the landlord, and then to deduct the rent from their paycheques? In many cases it has resulted in individuals getting zero paycheques because the rent is deducted from their paycheques.

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member has brought that problem to my attention through correspondence. It is being fully investigated at present. I hope to be able to respond to his letter by the end of this week.

3:10 p.m.

Mr. Cooke: First, I would like to point out to the Minister of Labour that the local employment standards office of his ministry indicated to me over the phone that there is nothing in the Employment Standards Act to prohibit this practice from continuing.

I would like to ask the minister whether he will also consult with the Minister of Colleges and Universities (Miss Stephenson), because her ministry is in charge of St. Clair College, and St. Clair College uses Ambassador Building Maintenance, which contracts out its janitorial work. It pays employees \$3.50 an hour and uses these kinds of employment practices. Does he not believe the government should not be participating with an employer such as this in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: I believe it would be appropriate for me to hear the results of our investigation before I make off-the-cuff comments about a circumstance.

FLOOD PLAIN MAPPING

Mr. Ruston: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Natural Resources. Is the minister aware that his ministry's guidelines as

to flood plain mapping, administered by the conservation authorities, are causing extreme hardship on land owners in areas so designated?

Hon. Mr. Pope: Mr. Speaker, if the member for Essex North is asking me whether I am aware that from time to time some problems may arise with the application of provincial flood plain policies, the answer is yes. My own riding of Timmins was the site of the 1960 Mattagami River flood, or the Timmins flood, which is the standard for a good part of the province; that clearly indicated to this government back then the need to have a flood plain policy to prevent loss of life, loss of property and substantial damage. Based on that and on the Hurricane Hazel incident, as well as a number of other incidents, this government in the 1960s adopted a flood plain policy and started looking at areas that were susceptible to flooding.

I recall that we did flood plain mapping in the honourable member's area. It was very controversial when it was introduced. Everyone said that it was completely unrealistic and that the floods would never happen. Lo and behold, when the Essex flood came it was within half an inch of the predicted flood guideline.

I am aware that individual problems can be created for people. We tried to address that last year when cabinet adopted a refinement to the two-fringe concept to allow for construction in some of the areas less susceptible to flooding. We have tried to have special policy areas to moderate the impact of the flood plain guidelines. We have gone out time and again to discuss these policies with the people who are affected. We are trying to do our best to be flexible in the application, through both the conservation authorities and the government, but we are committed as a government to having in place some flood damage reduction program.

We do not want to see the situation now seen in the Mississippi River system where they paved over so much of the system, where they failed to allocate flood plains for the protection of people, and they get \$20 million in damage every year in Louisiana state alone.

Mr. Ruston: The minister and I do not disagree to a point when one has flooding. But when the government designates areas that have never been flooded in 100 years, houses with basements are sitting there side by side and have never been flooded in 55 years, and when they cannot build on them but it is not even in the registry office, so the property is not even in zoning, that is ridiculous.

Hon. Mr. Pope: The member probably said the same thing about the Essex-Windsor region in 1978, and it was proved correct then—

Mr. Ruston: You don't know what you are talking about.

Hon. Mr. Pope: I do not know what I am talking about? I have done a specific study of the Windsor flood, and the member opposite does not know what he is talking about.

Mr. Swart: Mr. Speaker, surely the minister knows that the procedures under the present act are arbitrary. There is no notice of appeal to the individual when these flood lines are placed on his property. There is no way he can appeal and there is no arbitration from that decision.

Does the minister not agree with the Deputy Premier (Mr. Welch), who indicated when this question was raised last Friday that he felt it would probably be appropriate to change this whole system so it was brought under the Planning Act and there would be those rights of notification and appeal? Does the minister agree with him and will he promote that kind of a change?

Hon. Mr. Pope: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member knows the flood plain policy is one of the policies that will be applied under the Planning Act. He has been aware of that for a considerable period of time. Therefore, he is aware that as a provincial policy that will take effect under the Planning Act, there is some right of consultation.

He is also fully aware of exactly what happened in Timmins. That city adopted, in its official plan and zoning bylaw, hazard land designation that affected 250 homes. It was brought before the Ontario Municipal Board. Every single property owner attended and each had his say. They had questions on the provincial policy and its application on a local basis. The member knows full well that right is available. As soon as the local municipality makes that designation under the official plan, they can have a complete, formal hearing. We have already had an informal hearing for them.

The member knows full well all the consultation on this issue that has gone on since 1977 between the Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority and all the municipalities in his area.

Mr. Speaker: The time for oral questions has expired.

USE OF TIME IN QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Bradley: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: I think it is interesting to note that today,

since you have adopted your new policy, by my calculation there were six questions asked by this party, five questions asked by the New Democratic Party and two questions asked by the Conservative Party, for a total of 13 questions. So it is obvious your new restraint policy in the House is working.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you very much. Obviously it cannot work without the co-operation of all members, and I wish to thank everybody.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

MISSIONARY CHURCH CANADA EAST ACT

Mrs. Scrivener moved, seconded by Mr. J. A. Taylor, first reading of Bill Pr4, An Act respecting the Missionary Church Canada East.

Motion agreed to.

DAVE HOLLIDAY LIMITED ACT

Mr. McKessock moved, seconded by Mr. G. I. Miller, first reading of Bill Pr8, An Act to revive Dave Holliday Limited.

Motion agreed to.

CHURCH OF THE VIRGIN MARY AND ST. ATHANASIUS ACT

Mr. Jones moved, seconded by Mr. Kennedy, first reading of Bill Pr16, An Act to revive the Coptic Orthodox Patriarchate of Alexandria, the Church of the Virgin Mary and St. Athanasius.

Motion agreed to.

3:20 p.m.

CITY OF MISSISSAUGA ACT

Mr. Jones moved, seconded by Mr. Kennedy, first reading of Bill Pr1, An Act respecting the City of Mississauga.

Motion agreed to.

ARBOUR DAY ACT

Mr. Kennedy moved, seconded by Mr. Lane, first reading of Bill 21, An Act to proclaim Arbour Day.

Motion agreed to.

PARKING FACILITIES FOR PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED PERSONS ACT

Mr. Kennedy moved, seconded by Mr. Jones, first reading of Bill 22, An Act to provide Parking Facilities for Physically Handicapped Persons.

Motion agreed to.

THUNDER BAY UNITED CHURCH CAMPS INC. ACT

Mr. Hennessy moved, seconded by Mr. MacQuarrie, first reading of Bill Pr10, An Act to revive Thunder Bay United Church Camps Inc.

Motion agreed to.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE (continued)

Resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, I possibly should—

Mr. Stokes: Recap.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Recap. That is a great suggestion. That is the most positive suggestion I have had come from the New Democratic Party today.

Mr. Wildman: He said recant, not recap.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: I just want to refresh members' memories. I know they were all so attentive yesterday afternoon that they would want to put the remainder of my remarks in focus.

Mr. Ruston: I missed the last 10 minutes, Jim. Could you please repeat that?

Mr. Stokes: Did you read Hansard? It didn't read all that well.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: The last 10 minutes? I have not had the opportunity of reading Hansard, but I hope it makes some sense. Of course, I will be delighted to discuss it with my friend on some future occasion.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, I was very impressed with the remarks of the leader of the third party when he reminded the House of the growing needs of the elderly of this province and in particular the concerns he had for residents in nursing homes. I think he was serious. I think he was not acting in any political way in expressing his real, deep-seated, heartfelt concern for those persons who had to leave their homes and possibly spend the rest of their lives in nursing homes.

I was sympathetic, because I think all of us share that concern. It is not a matter to politicize. It is a continuing need of society that must be addressed regardless of which party is in power at any particular moment. It is a need that will continue to grow as the population

ages. All of us become more mentally and physically disabled as we get older; it is part of the ageing process. I will not comment on the age of the opposition.

Mr. Stokes: Almost as old as the government.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: That may be. What I am really saying, and I think what the leader of the third party was saying as well, is that there is a big problem out there. There is a big need that not only is being addressed but also must be addressed in a more effective and sympathetic way in the future. I share that, as I am sure members of the Liberal Party would share that.

He read a litany of letters that were mostly negative. I think many of those criticisms were well-founded. But I tried to point out that there is another side. There is the side of those residents in nursing homes who have never had the level of care they are currently enjoying. I refer to people who have never had the attention and who have never been able to share with others, who were sympathetic, their problems and their concerns as many of the residents in our nursing homes experience today.

So there are the two sides. I suppose, if one wanted to get into a contest in terms of saying we have more letters in support of our nursing homes than we have objecting to nursing homes, we could do that, but that is not constructive; I do not think anybody intends that.

What I guess we are all saying is that there will be a growing need and that need will have to be continually addressed. There is probably some room for stricter enforcement of present regulations, and there may be some need for basic change in the types of accommodation that some elderly persons utilize at present.

I commented on that because—

Mr. Kerrio: Because you are getting older; that is why.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Besides my infirmity, I was thinking of the continuing and accelerating infirmity of some of my good friends and colleagues in the opposition parties and the need, if possible, for an improved system of care as we graduate to some of these other facilities.
3:30 p.m.

Getting back to the relevance of those remarks to the principal thrust of the throne speech, which was an economic thrust, there is a continuing need to support in a financial sense the large spectrum of social services that we not only enjoy but must continue to expand and improve.

In other words, I suppose it is simplistic for

the third party to suggest the answer is to nationalize the nursing home system. I personally do not agree with that and I do not think we have to find new ways of discovering government involvement. I think we must find new ways to create national wealth, instead of merely finding new ways to share it.

I then went on to what I perceive are some basic structural changes in the economy of this country, this province and this continent. In that regard, I mentioned we have seen an evolution of our productive system, an evolution or change from a high volume, standardized type of production to the need for, if not in fact the accomplishment of, a more flexible system of production; in other words, a transition. That transition would, of course, require a basic restructuring of business, labour and government.

In that process, I pointed out what is happening and what has happened since the early 1960s, which is basically the transformation of a domestic market to a world market, from a domestic marketplace to a world marketplace. In the early 1960s, for example, probably eight per cent of the commerce and industry of the United States was exposed in terms of imports; today it is probably 30 per cent.

The high volume, standardized production which really created the wealth of the United States and this country is a type of production that has now been transferred to what were developing countries or Third World countries. Those countries initially concentrated their production, in terms of their cheap labour, in the toy industry, the shoe industry, the clothing industry and that type of thing.

In regard to the transfer to those nations, I may say I had the opportunity some 15 or 20 years ago to visit a number of the Pacific Rim countries to look at those economies. Not too long ago I had the opportunity to return and to see the dramatic change and shift. The so-called developing countries now have the capital intensive, sophisticated, often automated equipment that mass produces.

This is mass production by a population that does not have the expectation in terms of general welfare and standard of living that we do in this country and on this continent, so that it has become very difficult for our industry to compete with that industry. We can now see countries that earlier got into mass produced, standardized production, such as Japan, Taiwan, Hong Kong and Singapore, getting out of that into more sophisticated, flexible types of pro-

duction where skills are more important. I would say Japan is the leader in that regard.

Mr. Conway: Have you been reading *The Atlantic Monthly*?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Yes, I have. If the member for Renfrew North was here yesterday, I referred to *The Atlantic Monthly* and to the article entitled "The Next American Frontier," by Robert Reich, in the March issue.

Mr. Conway: You have read the other one too?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Yes, I have, in response to my well-informed friend.

Mr. Conway: I was not here yesterday.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: I know the member was not here and I accept his apologies for not understanding what I had said.

I think it is imperative that we appreciate what is happening in the world marketplace. Yesterday I pointed out in part that this world marketplace has also become a world marketplace for banks. I do not want to get into the banking system today and what has happened there—the judgement calls, the financing of sovereign countries, the financing of very large multinational corporations, and whether banks really can control whom they lend to.

Mr. Stokes: *Towers of Gold, Feet of Clay*.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Yes. I will not be decoyed by that. I thought that *Towers of Gold, Feet of Clay* was a very interesting book. I have read that as well. I thought it was rather biased. If the author, Walter Stewart, had been more objective in his presentation, the book would have more credibility. He made some excellent points and I think he did a great deal of research. To some degree his credibility was weakened because of the obvious bias in the book.

I will not go into that area, but just point out that there is a world marketplace now in terms of our banking institutions. We could bring that back to—

Mr. Mackenzie: I think it is time to enter the temples and overturn the tables.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: The member can turn religious if he likes, but I am going to wait a little while. I am just an honest to God, solid, common Christian. I am not into the type of cult religion they have over there.

Mr. Breaugh: You are not born again.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: I will not be drawn into some of the academic and philosophical arguments I am sure the member for Renfrew North might

be drawn into or my good friend sitting behind him.

Since Bretton Woods and the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank, we have seen the development of the single marketplace; and remember the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, which was philosophically to reduce world tariffs, so that again we become more exposed to world competition. I think it is imperative to appreciate and set that picture and understand that tone when we look at what government must do in a very serious and constructive way in terms of ensuring we recover and experience a healthy economy.

3:40 p.m.

I would suggest that particular attention be paid to training or retraining workers to perform effectively in flexible production systems. This, in many cases, will involve more than learning a new set of technical skills. It will demand an additional change—an attitudinal change, a mental reorientation towards really what constitutes a job. I say that because of the new flexible approach that workers are going to have to take. Not that straight line approach with a pecking order, but really a co-operative approach in terms of identifying problems and solving those problems.

Another area that will have a profound import on the way in which our economic future unfolds is labour relations. I have spoken on this over the past number of years. Frankly, I think it is time we took a more civilized approach in terms of settling industrial disputes. I think the adversarial approach, the approach that seems to polarize prejudice and create more friction, is obsolete.

But I will not develop some of the suggestions I have made in the past in that regard. I am just putting it to you, Mr. Speaker, that we are going to have to change our attitude and basic approach in the whole field of labour relations.

One of the causes of our poor showing on productivity is the amount of time lost in strikes and lockouts. Unfortunately, Canada leads the world in this category.

Mr. Conway: And the Ontario Legislature must lead Canada in that category—what could be more unproductive than this Legislature?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, have we had enough interjections? May I carry on? I do not want to respond to the accuracy or inaccuracy—may I say to some degree I rely on statistical material that my research digs out for me, and we can debate that, I know.

Mr. Mackenzie: I am not a betting man but I will make a bet on that.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Sure, sure, any time.

The Deputy Speaker: The honourable member for Prince Edward-Lennox.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Yes, Mr. Speaker, thank you for ensuring that I do not wander from my chosen path.

Mr. Conway: The chosen path took him from Scarborough to Napanee in short order, but that is another story.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Sure, and as I say, I will not let the member decoy me. Again, I was not speaking in a geographical sense and I will leave that for another occasion.

Between 1971 and 1980, for example, we lost on average 896 person-days of work per 1,000 employees a year because of industrial conflict. During the same period—and I think members will be interested in this—the United Kingdom, which we often perceive as a nation usually on strike, lost in the average year 539 days, the United States lost 437 days, Japan lost 103 days and West Germany lost a mere 42 days.

Certainly it is difficult to compete when you lose twice as much production time as your competitors. High-technology equipment is useless if it is sitting idle. Labour and management must finally accept that it is ridiculous in the high-tech 1980s to conduct their relations on assumptions and perceptions typical of the 1920s.

It is also vital at this very sensitive period that workers in the private and public sectors continue to exercise restraint in their wage and salary demands. I appreciate that the question of the level of wages and salaries is a contentious one. I am also aware of the Citibank study, which shows that for the period from 1970 to 1981 Canadian labour costs increased less than in any other industrialized country except the United States.

The problem in Canada has been that salary increases cannot be justified in terms of productivity increases. From 1972 to 1982 Canadian wages increased at an average annual rate of 11.3 per cent. During the same period our productivity increased at an average annual rate of 0.1 per cent. The hard fact is that entering the 1980s we were being paid more and were producing less. This is obviously a trend that cannot continue if we hope to compete effectively in the future.

The speech from the throne speaks of increasing entrepreneurship in small and medium-sized

businesses and of increasing innovation in all sectors of our economy. I believe that government's ability to achieve these goals through unilateral action is extremely limited. In this House we cannot pass laws that demand that people take economic risks or have ideas. We can, however, create an environment in which risk taking is more attractive and innovation is more likely to occur and to be supported and implemented. I hope the policies and programs proposed in the throne speech will create that environment.

The focus on small business is quite appropriate. That sector has proved to be the most innovative and flexible in our economy; it can respond more quickly and effectively to new opportunities than can larger firms. All too easily do some relegate to the sunset category industries like the automobile industry, which would, and could if properly managed, continue to make a significant contribution to our economy. That is not a mistake this government will make.

Directly or indirectly the auto industry accounts for one of every six jobs in this province and serves as a base for approximately one fifth of our entire economy. It is our major manufacturing and export industry. This government believes that the auto industry can still be a very positive force in our economy.

Mr. Stokes: Do you drive a Lada or a Mercedes?
3:50 p.m.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: May I just say to my friend the member for Lake Nipigon that when his leader spoke yesterday, I was courteous. I listened courteously to him. I thought that he was sincere in what he was saying. As a matter of fact, I was supportive of much of what he said.

Mr. Haggerty: Don't go too far, now.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: I drew the line as I always draw the line, I would expect, for a party that wants to nationalize at an ever escalating rate—and I understand their platform and their philosophy, I understand what they want to do to the health care industry. But I would hope that they would take me as seriously in my concerns for our economy. That is essential if we are going to fund these very necessary and vital social welfare programs. So I ask them to be serious.

If the member for Lake Nipigon wants me to answer his interjection, I will tell him what car I am driving. I drive a Buick LeSabre, if that is relevant to his party's philosophy. I might also say that I purchased, at the same time, a K car, a

yellow station wagon. If he wants more details, it is a Dodge Aries. I discovered, after I bought it, that it has a Japanese engine. That is my patriotic gesture and that is what I am driving.

I do not think that is really relevant to the tone or to the thrust of my remarks.

The Deputy Speaker: And so you will drive back to the main road.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: But I did feel that possibly if that is critical to the core of that party's philosophy, I should respond in an appropriate way.

The throne speech did mention a number of items that will be the subject matter, I am sure, of government policy and programs. Pension reform is one of those.

Mr. Boudria: The child rearing, drop-out provision.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Yes, maybe it is appropriate to respond, Mr. Speaker, because I am not being decoyed to my Liberal friend's interjection in regard to the drop-out for women. I would subscribe to that and embrace that recommendation in the report of the select committee on pensions. I do hope that before long we will see that implemented into Canadian law.

Mr. Cassidy: It requires this government to give its consent.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: To the member for Ottawa Centre, I understand all our learning is not achieved in universities. I was vitally involved in this matter some years ago and studied the subject very thoroughly. As chairman of the select committee on pensions I had occasion to refresh my memory and to review the current situation.

I fully understand Ontario's veto in regard to this particular provision which, if I may say, was a reason for not adopting the drop-out provision some years ago. But I want to tell the members that I think the current climate is such that this provision should be adopted and I only repeat myself when I say that I totally embrace the recommendations of the select committee in this regard.

Also, of course, the reference in the throne speech is for an Ontario approach to the federal government. While I think it is essential that we co-operate fully with the federal government, there are many things that we, in this province, can do in regard to pension reform, things that are within our constitutional authority and which we should do.

Mr. Conway: The Legislative Assembly retirement act.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: No, I haven't that in mind. It is an area that may preoccupy the honourable member's mind because of his specialized interest, but it certainly was not a consideration of mine.

Mr. Samis: From a rotten borough.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: In responding to the member for Cornwall, first, on behalf of the constituents of Prince Edward-Lennox, I would like to say they express resentment at a remark that I represent a rotten borough.

Mr. Samis: They are not that touchy.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: I am not that touchy, but we have such sound, conscientious citizens who have such a deep and long-embedded faith in the democratic process and the elected process that they would not like to hear that kind of remark coming from the New Democratic member for Cornwall. I just want to put that on the record for his edification.

Mr. Conway: The 1975 election results put that to rest anyway. What was it—600 votes?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: That is right. It certainly was. There is a historian. I can tell a historian.

Mr. Conway: Oh, I was just reminding you of that close race.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: The member does not have to remind me. I was almost a victim of that particular election, but fortunately the wife of the member for Cornwall was. She ran against me.

Mr. Speaker, through the member for Cornwall, I want to convey to her my congratulations on her election to the city council.

In any event, I do not want to be distracted from the remark and reference I was making in regard to pensions because I think most of the citizens of Ontario want to be self-reliant in their retirement. As a matter of fact, I think most citizens want to be able to stand on their own two feet throughout life.

If we are going to give our elderly citizens the opportunity to maintain their dignity and self-respect and self-reliance, then it is fundamental and, I think, vital that we implement pension reform in this province. That reform, of course, would and could follow the basic recommendations of the select committee on pensions.

For example, I would just mention the need to recognize in this day and age that employer contributions to workmen's pensions are in fact deferred wages, and as deferred wages those

moneys should be seen as vested so they become a part of the property of the employee.

Mr. Cassidy: That is a good socialist principle.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: It is not a socialist principle, it is a principle of conscience. When the members over there become less doctrinaire and understand that all human beings, we hope, will become more civilized as history goes on—

Mr. Cassidy: That is a good socialist principle.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: That is what the honourable member says. He can adopt what he wants as a socialist principle, but I am not going to get into an argument on that. I will debate you on socialism—

Mr. Cassidy: It is better than the law of the jungle.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: I do not want to get into practising the member's laws in this Legislature.

The Deputy Speaker: Reminding all honourable members that the member for Prince Edward-Lennox has the floor.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: I do want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I am delighted that the opposition party subscribes to the principle of deferred wages and of immediate vesting. The select committee has recommended that the vesting initially be five years. We hope that vesting will evolve without too much delay so that we will have vesting, say, after a year.

Mr. Cassidy: It is a pity your party does not agree with us.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: If that happens, that would ensure to the workers of this province a satisfactory retirement in their future. It would certainly liberate them in terms of their mobility so they could travel from job to job. I think that is important today, and a flexible system of production is important so that workers can be mobile.

4 p.m.

Mr. Cassidy: Workers of the world unite.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: That is right from Karl Marx. I appreciate the member's learning as well. You have only your chains to lose, gentlemen over there, and you have a world to win, a world to gain.

Interjections.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: The trouble with the third party is it seems it has no room to manoeuvre. They have to become radicals.

As a matter of fact, the member for Hamilton East (Mr. Mackenzie), if I am not mistaken, referred to his leader as a radical socialist. I do

not want to get drawn into that either, but I had hoped the member had become more moderate in his views and would support the government when it pronounces policies that are sensible and advance the welfare of the people of this province.

Mr. Samis: Announce your nomination.

Mr. Conway: Get the lead out, Jim.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: I am not running for the federal leadership. I do not think so anyway.

Mr. Conway: What about the federal Tory nomination in Hastings?

Mr. McClellan: Are you going to the convention?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Which convention? If they send their invitations I will consider them all. No reasonable offer will be refused.

Mr. Cassidy: To make you feel better, we supported you for Speaker. We still do.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Thank you very much. In seriousness, I appreciate that. I take that seriously because I think he has, and I think we have, sincere people of good conscience on all sides of the House who are here because they really want to serve their fellow man. I mean that. I think the member subscribes to that.

I will not take up any more time but I thought I must say, talking in terms of the welfare of the senior citizens of this province, that we have to start in terms of our children, citizens of an early age, who spend their lifetimes in the work force and who would rather have a pension plan they have supported and towards which they have contributed so they have the independence and security any citizen of this great province should have.

I want to thank all the members for their kind attention.

Mr. J. A. Reed: Mr. Speaker, listening to the comments that have been made in this throne speech debate so far, I marvel that it is such a wise decision on the part of the proceedings of this House not to rule anything out of order.

I also feel it does nothing but improve the level of debate when it comes to this particular throne speech, because I must say it is probably the most repetitive piece of regurgitation we have borne witness to in this Legislature in many years.

However, the latitude extended by the Legislature to the speakers allows us to deal with subject areas that were not mentioned in the throne debate but which, it is the belief of some

members, would at least have some level of importance to this Legislature.

Mr. Conway: Now tell us about water power.

Mr. J. A. Reed: I will tell my honourable friend that I will probably touch on the subject before these remarks are concluded, in spite of what the members may think.

Mr. Stokes: No, for the love of peat.

Mr. J. A. Reed: I would like to dwell at the outset on a subject area that had its active origin in the great town of Acton, Ontario, that town which was deleted from the official road map of Ontario in 1982 but for which a return has been promised in the next issue of the map. The good citizens of Acton were at least as incensed as I was when that omission was made and Acton was relegated to a blow-up view of the Toronto area.

A year ago, a handicapped citizen of Acton by the name of Lorne Doberthien, who is the owner of a business, undertook to bring to the attention of government the need for legislation governing parking for handicapped citizens. Mr. Doberthien is a recently handicapped individual and has therefore had the experience of both situations.

With visits and a campaign with various members of government and in the Legislature here, namely the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Snow), we were promised two things. One, that when the new plating system came into operation licence plates would be available on request to identify the handicapped owners of automobiles; and two, that uniform legislation would come into play to provide common legislation for all municipalities across the province.

To this date we have seen the move to introduce the licence plate for the handicapped owners of motor vehicles, but to the chagrin of many handicapped people we have discovered that to this point legislation has not been forthcoming from the government to provide uniformity for handicapped parking in every municipality in Ontario.

I was quite delighted that the member for Mississauga South (Mr. Kennedy) today introduced a private member's bill to that effect. He can be assured it will receive my support. The most the Minister of Transportation and Communications has been able to volunteer to this Legislature is that he is disappointed that municipalities have not adopted the uniform bylaw that was given to them concerning handicapped

parking. To this date, no further action has been taken officially.

It is to be hoped the government might make a rare exception and accept the private member's bill delivered to this Legislature by the member for Mississauga South. However, if the past record of the government is any indicator, we are going to wait a long time yet.

In my hand today I have quite a large number of letters from handicapped people in my riding expressing their very deep concern that while the licence plate move has been made by the government no move has been made to impose uniform legislation. I would like to read into the record a letter from the Hamilton Automobile Club that explains it probably as well as any other. I will just read a couple of paragraphs.

4:10 p.m.

"Unfortunately, most municipalities fail to accept the new MTC-issued plates as adequate to allow motor vehicles fitted with them to be parked in special areas designated for the handicapped. Presently, handicapped users are being misled into believing that their cars fitted with MTC issue may be parked in any reserved handicapped area.

"It is important that this misconception be cleared up immediately and that the Municipal Act be amended so as to provide a uniform bylaw allowing motorists whose vehicles are fitted with these new plates to park in spaces reserved for handicapped persons."

I cannot emphasize too forcefully the need for this kind of legislation. Surely in a province that prides itself as being enlightened we can give some very close attention to this important move forward and see to it that handicapped persons do not continue to be disadvantaged as they are at the present time.

Therefore this member, being the voice in this Legislature of one of the major creators of this idea, Mr. Doberthien, will continue to press the government to see that adequate provision be made.

I was quite impressed, as was the previous speaker, by some of the remarks made by the leader of the third party regarding nursing home care in Ontario and some of its obvious inadequacies. Incidentally, I believe those inadequacies are acknowledged by the Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Mrs. Birch). I do not want to restate the words of the leader of the third party, but hopefully to add to or expand on them somewhat.

The member summed up his comments on the problem by saying the answer lay in nation-

alizing or having all nursing home care in Ontario under government ownership and operation. I would like to respectfully suggest to the leader of the third party that the problem neither begins nor ends with the profit motive in this case.

The solution to the problems we experience on a day-to-day basis—and some of us in this Legislature have personal experience with problems as they arise—really lies in the provision of adequate inspection for nursing home operations. Until we have an adequate number of inspectors and can apply inspection on a uniform basis across all those areas that provide levels of nursing care, whether they be municipally controlled, private or whatever, we are going to have a continuation of these very serious problems.

There is one area that was not touched upon at all by the leader of the third party and I believe it is an area that has been critical in the province, concerning the care of elderly people, for at least as long as I have had the honour to serve in this Legislature. It concerns that group of residences known as rest homes.

We know there is a public perception that people who are residents of rest homes require a certain amount of care if they are elderly, disabled and so on. But to this date there is no legislation in place in Ontario governing the operation of rest homes, other than that provided at the same level for boarding houses. Yet the public concept is that those people who become residents of rest homes are entitled to certain levels of basic care. In fact, we have an appalling situation in Ontario where there are no rules of the game governing rest homes. While legislation has been promised from time to time, I believe since 1976, it has never been tabled in this Legislature.

The absence of legislation is unfair to the families of residents and to the owners and operators of rest homes. How can one expect any accepted level of care to take place as long as we treat them in a fashion no different from boarding houses, which is the way they are being treated at the present time.

I am deeply concerned about this matter. It is something the various ministries concerned have refused to take action on over the years. Perhaps the legislation is a little too difficult for them to consider, but the families of the people in rest homes and the people who operate rest homes need and want legislation. It is my belief the medical officers of health in the various municipalities agree legislation should be forth-

coming. I urge the government at this time to proceed with that kind of legislation with a sense of urgency.

In the last year I have changed portfolios from Energy to Natural Resources. It has been about a 12-month learning process to try to have some view of some parts of the largest and most diverse ministry in the province. Indeed, in that area I can sympathize with the difficulty the minister had going into his new portfolio and trying to get a grip on just what is happening in that ministry.

I have been impressed with the broad subject areas he has to deal with. I have been so impressed that I have recommended to the minister that the ministry really should be divided. There is at least one subject area that should become a ministry unto itself, and that is the area of mining. As we go along and gain experience and depth, there may be more areas that might well lend themselves to a separate and distinct ministry.

Surely it is accepted that many of the subject areas overlap between mining and natural resources. There is also an overlap between natural resources and energy. In those areas, liaison has to be strengthened and policies adopted that complement the various ministries.

Once again, I suggest to the minister and to the government as a whole that a new look be given to the Ministry of Natural Resources in terms of the subject areas it is required to carry, because it is an incredibly steep order for any minister. It is no wonder we can say, and I am sure the minister would not disagree, that in many areas it is the bureaucracy that controls the branches of the Ministry of Natural Resources and which considers it has a mandate to apply the legislation. It is very difficult for the minister to undertake the innovative and creative measures he must undertake for the economic and resource development future in Ontario.

Recently the minister and I met at a public meeting in my riding discussing the concerns of citizens over the designation of land for future aggregate extraction. In Halton, outside the Niagara Escarpment, the ministry has identified and originally wanted to impose controls or designation on 16,000 acres of land. On top of that, a recommendation was made by the hearing officers on the Niagara Escarpment that a further overlay take place on the escarpment.

4:20 p.m.

I have to tell members that the designation of land in the manner in which the ministry is proposing it is unacceptable to the citizens of

Halton-Burlington and will be found, as time goes on, unacceptable to the citizens of those other ridings that contain aggregate potential. We have borne witness to the imposition of government by policy in this matter rather than government by legislation.

We saw initially a mistake made by the government when it used a threat not to approve official plans to impose land designation in Caledon and in Durham. We saw one judicial decision made in the township of Puslinch using the aggregate policy, the one that Mr. John Masham of the Ministry of Natural Resources says was not cabinet approved. We saw the attempt to make the overlay in Halton. That was when the good citizens of Halton stood up in a body, side by side with their elected municipal officials, to say: "Listen, this is going too far. You must not do this."

It is interesting to note that even now, in terms of the resource base available for the aggregate industry, in terms of licences and active pits at the moment, there is more aggregate available than will be used by the industry to the end of this century. So when we are talking about attempting to designate 16,000 acres of land in Halton for the exclusive use of aggregates in the future we are handicapping a whole municipality. Indeed, we are asking that municipality to do far more than its fair share in supplying aggregates to the Metropolitan Toronto area.

Now I recognize that the aggregate industry is important to the construction business in Ontario and the supply of aggregates is necessary, and an economic supply at that. But I say to the minister and to those officials in his ministry who wish to designate this land that if he were to proceed on the basis upon which he started he would be handicapping a whole ring of ridings around the Metropolitan Toronto area for years and years to come. He would be preventing them from carrying out their normal plans for the future. He would be preventing them from carrying on natural industrial development, and housing development as the need arises, and so on. He would be putting priority on aggregates to the detriment of all other uses.

There are a few exceptions and those exceptions have been made public. In one case the Ministry of Agriculture and Food has said, in concert with the minister's new aggregate policy, that agricultural land used for aggregate extraction would have to be restored to its original productivity.

Let me suggest to the minister that the people

who created that statement either had no understanding of the difficulty of achieving a restoration of that kind or perhaps made the statement knowing full well it was impossible to achieve a recreation of productivity. One cannot recreate a microclimate, one cannot recreate the water table relationships that existed before aggregate extraction, so such statements really do not have much foundation in fact.

I would say to the minister that the attempted imposition of these policies has aroused a distrust in the participation process. It has aroused very deep fears and in some cases resentment and anger.

To this date we do not have a new aggregate bill to accompany the new aggregate policy, and therefore we have no real way of knowing just how the two will dovetail in the future. But there are some fundamental concerns that I believe should be addressed in the new bill.

One, of course, is not only to recognize that we understand that aggregates are not evenly distributed all over the province but also to recognize that municipalities should not be expected to deliver more than their fair share of aggregates. The minister knows I have been told that we in Halton deliver 50 per cent of the aggregates from this small area into the metropolitan area.

Surely the minister through his legislation can ensure that Halton is not asked to do substantially more, as it would be asked to do with the designation of 18,000 acres. Surely the minister can ensure legislation so that the municipalities can maintain control over the location of pits and quarries. Surely that could be a fundamental in the legislation.

The bill that died before the 1981 election, Bill 175 as it was known, placed the final authority in the hands of the Minister of Natural Resources. It gave the minister unprecedented control over aggregates in the future. The danger in this is that while one minister may have the finest of intentions governments do not remain and ministers do not remain. People change, personnel change over the years—the present minister (Mr. Pope) replaced another one, the late James Auld, a very fine Minister of Natural Resources—and people's attitudes and thinking change.

It is therefore not legislatively sound to give a cabinet minister powers that usurp the traditional powers of municipalities. Municipalities have their own plans, they have their own direction that they need to progress in, and that need should not be interfered with in the major way

this matter is being interfered in, especially through the application of policy.

4:30 p.m.

If the minister were to apply legislation, then this government and his ministry could stand or fall on that legislation, but we believe that government by policy is unacceptable. Policy can become a guideline, but to use the threat of not approving official plans, or to use other economic threats against municipalities if they do not accept policies, is cowardly, to say the least.

I suppose that politically it is a little more acceptable to the government, because it ends up not taking all the heat. The citizens of the riding of Halton-Burlington who are directly affected by future aggregate extraction do not subscribe to the notion of government by policy. They want government by legislation, because they want to know exactly where they will stand in the future.

A parallel situation could be referred to in terms of the flood plain mapping, an issue that has been discussed and raised in the past couple of days. That brings up an area of serious concern, because flood plain mapping is done by conservation authorities. We know that conservation authorities have no guidelines of process. They are kingdoms unto themselves. Their decisions on how they operate and what they consider to be their mandate are of their own choosing and their own creation.

Therefore, when flood plain mapping is being done in a particular area, one conservation authority will hold public meetings to discuss the future flood plain lines and another conservation authority will not. No guidelines are laid down to direct the conservation authorities as to their behaviour. They are only asked to subscribe to some government policy.

The result is that one set of flood plain guidelines will apply in one river valley and a completely different set will apply in another, although they are both supposed to originate from the same concept. That is because one conservation authority will have some public input and the management will undertake to take those views to the ministry when the final flood plain lines are being developed, while another conservation authority will ignore totally the idea of public input.

I may be open to criticism and I may be called not credible because I am not an engineer, but I suggest to the minister that some of the flood plain mapping is not done with accurate criteria. It is not done with the kind of competence

that is needed in the flood plain. I speak from personal experience.

At present, 80 per cent of the land mass of my own farm is in the flood plain. The minister is here, and I suggest to him that the flood line passes through the second storey of my house. I say further that the house has been there since 1820 and during Hurricane Hazel there was no water in the basement of that house.

Perhaps some of the criteria are used and some of the flood plain mapping is applied by people who live in apartments in Toronto, who go downtown to their computers every day and never set foot on a flood plain from one year to the next, or who do not experience annual high water levels and so on.

Now, having said that—

Mr. Harris: Put in a turbine so you can generate electricity when the flood comes.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Robinson): Order.

Mr. J. A. Reed: The honourable member suggests we might put a turbine in and use the flood waters. I will just tell him that we are about three years ahead of him now.

But in regard to preserving public safety, I have to go on record as supporting a reasoned application of flood plain lines. Certainly we cannot accept or tolerate a repeat of the devastation of Hurricane Hazel, and the flood plain guidelines are set up to prevent that. Presumably they are erring on the side of safety, and we will give them credit. But I suggest to the minister that the conservation authorities that are applying these flood plain lines must remain flexible; there must be a process of contact between the citizens who live in the flood plains and the government. If there is explanation to be made, it should be made.

I am often concerned that instead of explanations, the business of turning down an application for a building permit, for instance, very often is done in an atmosphere of intimidation rather than in an atmosphere of conciliation or of explanation or sometimes in an atmosphere of give and take. Very often it is too easy for a government bureaucrat simply to use an intimidating approach to those citizens who live in flood plain areas.

The reason it happens is that the ministry does not supply the kinds of guidelines to conservation authorities that tell them they have got to become involved in this reciprocal process where citizens and conservation authorities can sit down together through a process of

reason and negotiation and come up with something understandable and solid.

That also goes with the necessity to be strong and strengthen the whole question of filling in flood plains. Filling in flood plains is one of the great sins of the past, which we hope has come to an end once and for all. It is one of the kinds of activities in flood plains that take the onus away from one land owner, or stop him from sharing in the rising of water, and throw the rising water on to the other land owners in the flood plain. There are areas of those controls that I find most acceptable and most supportable, but I suggest once again that it has to be a matter of reciprocity, of give and take and of understanding.

I have spoken on the subject of resource development before as the Energy critic, and I would like to refer the House to an article that appeared in the *Toronto Star* on April 25, entitled "Renewable Energy Use to Grow: Study." It says:

"Washington—The world's use of renewable energy will double by the year 2000, when the sun, wind and water will be supplying power equal to the amount of energy obtained from oil, a study predicts. The Worldwatch Institute forecasts a great future for all forms of renewable energy."

If anyone feels that renewable energy is not a natural resource issue, I have news, because it is a most basic natural resource issue. Just to give the government a few examples of what is happening in renewable energy utilization in the rest of the world, this article shows that in China there are 90,000 hydraulic power installations in operation, including 15,000 that are being installed at present, and that 11 per cent of the homes in Japan and 33 per cent in Israel have solar water heating. The Israeli total should hit 60 per cent by the mid-1980s.

California is leading a global breakthrough in harnessing wind power. In the past year, 1,000 wind machines have been hooked into the state's electric power grid and another 1,700 machines are planned for 1983. I could go on.

4:40 p.m.

It seems ironic that the whole question of renewable energy has been put on the back burner by this government, probably because it has not achieved the high profile it did a couple of years ago when we had what was an apparent glut in the ability to deliver oil. I use that phrase advisedly, a glut in the ability to deliver. There is no such thing as a glut of oil in the world, there is only an inventory. It is just the ability to move it

compared to the people who want to consume it.

I believe the president of the Ontario Energy Corp. has gone on public record as saying, "Be sure that this so-called glut and this depression in prices is temporary." It has been predicted that if the free market continues to prevail, and I hope it does in petroleum, certainly outside of Canada—it is not prevailing so much in Canada at the moment—it will result in what will be a perceived shortage in seven, eight or nine years.

In other words, we are going through cycles that were predicted by the Club of Rome, in its book *The Limits to Growth*, as far back as 1967. As the world's nonrenewable energies reduce in availability, become more expensive and so on, this cyclical glut and shortage will apply for many years to come. Therefore, it behooves any government wanting to participate in the development of renewable energy to use this time as a relief valve to get on with the job.

Instead, what we continue to have through the various ministries is only a token addressing of the problem. The Ministry of Natural Resources, after seven years of effort on behalf of this side of the House, has finally released a couple of power sites on long-term leases to private enterprise to restart small hydraulic power installations. One can understand why they are reluctant. It is so embarrassing to Ontario Hydro. It has to be embarrassing because that power can be produced more cheaply by the private sector and wholesaled into the grid at a profit when Ontario Hydro cannot even touch it—

Interjection.

Mr. J. A. Reed: That is true. I know—

Mr. Andrewes: What time of day?

Mr. J. A. Reed: I beg your pardon. I missed that.

Mr. Andrewes: What time of day do they buy the power?

The Acting Speaker: Please ignore the interjections and continue with your remarks.

Mr. J. A. Reed: The only buyer of electric power is Ontario Hydro, and it does not buy it at retail. It buys it at wholesale from these independent entrepreneurs, and it will not buy it on time of day right now. If the honourable member tells me we cannot store the energy, he does not understand the technology. He should know that some of Ontario Hydro's newer installations are what are called peaking stations. He

should understand that certain things can be done with hydraulic power—

Interjection.

Mr. J. A. Reed: The Minister of Natural Resources has a long challenge ahead of him to get his ministry staff, his own people, enthusiastically on side to support this kind of resource development.

I ask the minister to look upon the whole application of this technology as an exercise in conservation, because that is precisely what it is. If we have 7,000, or some people say 14,000, megawatts of hydraulic power available to be developed and redeveloped in Ontario, I ask him to get on with the job.

It is going to be embarrassing to them, especially when the Darlington nuclear plant comes on line at a cost far exceeding the cost of restarting a lot of these smaller sites by private enterprise, but it is an evolution that has to come. It is an idea whose time is long overdue.

The minister knows that, and I am sure he agrees with that, but he has to get his own people on side. Whatever good intentions he may have personally, he has to make sure they are being delivered out on the firing line. To this date, that delivery is not universal in enthusiasm. The minister knows that, and I know that.

This brings us to the question of economic recovery in this province. For each of the initiative areas the government outlined in the speech from the throne, one can put after it, as one of the answers, resource development to stimulate business investment significantly over the next two years.

If one really wants to follow that signpost in the speech from the throne, the thing one has to do is to go back and look at the regulations of the Ministry of Natural Resources regarding some of the resource development areas and the way they are applied. One will find that in some cases they will be obstacles to the kind of progress that has to take place.

To double foreign trade over the next five years: What a commendable objective. Here, one can go directly into renewable energy development. I say to the Minister of Natural Resources, if the free enterprise system can put renewable energy—hydraulic power, solar power, wind power or whatever—on stream with Ontario-created technology, Ontario-improved technology and so on, then for goodness' sakes, we have something to sell to the rest of the world, we have something to sell to the Caribbean.

I happen to have had the pleasure of being in the Caribbean for a couple of weeks during the

winter, and I saw the incredible potential for export sales and reciprocal trade; but until we have some technology that we are capable of exporting, we are not going to get anywhere. One can talk all one likes about high-tech industries, but these are not high-tech industries; they are medium-tech industries where we can show the way and lead the world. Until we do it ourselves, we cannot take it anywhere.

Increase the domestic market expansion: Once again, one can go back to resource development. The minister knows there is an incredible energy potential that is sitting wasting in northern Ontario at present, which with a little seed money and assistance from government could provide a substantial energy base for the market that is already here, a market where money is being expended to the tune of \$11 billion or more a year for energy that we bring into this province from outside. The minister knows this, and we have talked about this many times before.

We say that in 1983 it perhaps does not appear to be politically sexy to talk about making liquid fuels from forest wastes. Perhaps it does not, because we are paying as low as 19.9 cents at the gas pumps now. But mark my words, that is temporary. That is a temporary blip on the whole petroleum scene that will come to an end. We have the opportunity to use that time to get our technology working and make it applicable to Ontario. We are not touching it; we are not doing a thing to increase the productivity and entrepreneurship of small and medium-sized businesses.

4:50 p.m.

Once again we can go back to resource development and renewable energy. A good many of these energy technologies lend themselves completely to small and medium-sized businesses. They do not necessarily lend themselves to large, production-line businesses, especially at present.

We have studied the application of solar water heating in Ontario, and it is ironic to look at the way we did it. We put the study of solar water heating in the charge of Ontario Hydro, and the result was not too promising. If there ever was an instance of the turning of the fox into the chicken coop, that was it.

I know my friends on the left want to have Ontario Hydro's mandate expanded so that it includes lots of other forms of energy, at least according to the former member for York South.

Ontario Hydro's mandate has to be confined

and it has to be confined to the thing that they have historically done best: the generation of electric power. These other ventures into new technologies for application in Ontario have to come under other wings. We cannot turn these things loose to an organization with as large a vested interest as Ontario Hydro. It is just—

Mr. Stokes: Confine it, something like Petro-Canada.

Mr. Martel: Touché.

Mr. J. A. Reed: Have it your way. Whatever you like.

Mr. Sweeney: Are the NDP against Petro-Canada now?

Mr. Martel: Not at all.

Mr. Stokes: We just want to know where he stands on it.

Mr. J. A. Reed: The honourable member brought up Petro-Canada, and I suppose nothing is out of order in this debate. We can talk about a federal issue if we like. If we want to talk about the oil business in Ontario, let us talk about Suncor. That is something that applies directly to Ontario, and I could talk the clock out on that exercise in idiocy undertaken with the opposition of the Treasurer of Ontario (Mr. F. S. Miller). There were four people privy to that purchase. One of them was opposed; he had to swallow the words he had spoken six weeks before in Quebec and come back here and justify that \$650-million fiasco. That one has to go down in history as the largest ego trip the Premier and his henchmen have taken in a long time.

I do not think it matters much whether the price of oil goes up, down or sideways. We are never going to be able to look on Suncor as one of the moments when the government looked to the future with any kind of vision.

To digress back to the line I was working on here—

The Deputy Speaker: Digressing back to the throne speech.

Mr. J. A. Reed: —increasing innovation in all sectors of our economy, I suggested a number of years ago to the Minister of Energy (Mr. Welch), and the Minister of Natural Resources should be aware of this too, that we do have the opportunity to innovate if we will only seize upon it. We have literally billions of dollars' worth of assets sitting in Ontario which are not being effectively put to use.

Our concept of forest utilization is based on a combination essentially of the pulp and paper

industry and the sawlog industry. We have continued to ignore the byproducts from those industries which have the capability of providing energy on a much larger scale than they provide at present.

I know that some of the pulp and paper industries have taken it upon themselves to utilize their own wastes, and they have done it very well. They have done it in spite of the apparent lack of co-operation, sometimes, from areas of government, or quasi-government. Ontario Hydro, which could be of great help in co-operating with the aspirations of some of the pulp and paper companies, is not. It is simply putting obstacles in the way, perhaps because it considers the generation of electric power, for instance, as competition.

I suggest to this government that such should not be the case if we are going to make progress. I believe Ontario Hydro has its own role to play in energy production in this province. It does not have the only role to play, nor does it have the only role to play in the generation of electricity, and should not be considered to have.

I say to the government that if Ontario Hydro, for instance, as the only purchaser of electricity from the private sector cannot pay enough for that electricity, then the private sector should be encouraged to go out into the marketplace and sell the power it can produce, because it knows its own cost. The real cost then would be boiled down to the ability of that entrepreneur to produce.

For goodness' sake, one cannot have a more free market than that. Perhaps that should bring reality back to this overexpanded utility so we could do it through innovation. We can do it through innovation and resource development. We have to get on with the job. We have to identify where the obstacles are, where they lie within the various ministries. Whether it is the Ministry of Energy, the Ministry of Natural Resources, or whatever, surely we can identify those obstacles, deal with them and move ahead.

I am concerned that the Ministry of Natural Resources has a protectionist instinct about it that often does not allow it, by virtue of its considered mandate, to move ahead. I think the minister would sympathize with me to a certain extent. It does not consider itself to be an organization of service to the people. In fact, the function of the ministry is changing. It is evolving, and it is evolving very quickly. It is evolving as we pay more and more attention to

the need to develop resources in many different innovative ways than we have in the past.

Surely that should flag to the minister that he has to change the mandate of his ministry to a certain extent so it can serve the people rather than simply be the great arbiter that says no to every new idea that is brought forward.

It is unfortunate when that does happen. Very often reasons are not given for saying no and often, when reasons are given, they are quite debatable reasons. They are reasons that often do not have much foundation. I say to the minister that if we are going to move ahead there has to be a new joining of hands between the ministry and the private citizen. We cannot continue in this manner.

One of the specific items I would like to talk about before the hook comes out this afternoon has to do with the area of firefighting in the forest industry of Ontario. It has been suggested to me that the two water bombers which replaced the purchase of the now infamous Challenger jet are only about one sixth of the number necessary to be considered an effective fighting force for fire control in the forests of Ontario.

5 p.m.

Perhaps this is a good time to put on record a question to the minister, which I hope he will answer in a future speech, about whether or not his ministry will participate in the new federal government budget program.

Hon. G. W. Taylor: Help bail out the feds.

Mr. J. A. Reed: Well, it is going to be a shared proposition, as the Minister of Natural Resources knows. If he is going to buy some water bombers, I wonder if he is going to buy some more of these.

It is ironic that the same minister rejected that very water bomber on at least two previous occasions. I have the correspondence in my files, which shows that those CL-215 water bombers were rejected as not being suitable for fighting forest fires in Ontario. One has to ask the question, and I think it is a reasonable question, why did he then decide not to proceed with the expenditure of \$10 million for the Challenger jet but to proceed instead with the expenditure of \$13 million for the purchase of two water bombers that had not been considered acceptable by his ministry.

I think perhaps we all know the answer. Politics caught up with him on that and he had to do something. It is probably evident that these CL-215s are pretty good aircraft, and maybe the ministry could use some more of

them. The forest industry certainly says the ministry can use more of them, that we do need more if we are going to have an effective firefighting force over the forests of the province in the future.

Our province faces a lot of challenges in the resource sector. We will not make any progress until we recognize and accept the mistakes that have been made in the past and move on into a new future. It is the function of the critic of the official opposition to point out those failings and also to try to be constructive in his criticism so he can offer suggestions and help to the minister in order that he may move forward in a sensible and rational way.

I would suggest to him that the sooner he does, the sooner Ontario will embark on the economic recovery it needs and the sooner the north will embark on the economic recovery it needs so desperately. The minister must know, since he is from the good riding of Cochrane South, that of all of the basic demands in the north, the most important is to broaden the economic base so that people are not going to be victimized in the future, as they have been during this last recession, when one-industry towns closed up and people had to leave or go on unemployment insurance, welfare or whatever other option they had. To date this government has not paid enough attention to the north other than to its ability to provide some raw materials that come out of there.

There are so many opportunities, and we know mostly what they are. We need the political will to move ahead. If we do move ahead, sometimes haltingly, the Minister of Natural Resources knows he will get my support if he makes those forward moves. But if he continues simply to reflect the status quo, the minister will be criticized roundly in those areas as long as I remain Natural Resources critic.

So get on with the job. We have no place to go but up. The minister knows the government will get my support for all the positive moves I expect it to make as a result of this throne speech.

The Deputy Speaker: At this time I am very pleased to recognize the member for Sudbury East.

Mr. Martel: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I hope you will remain as pleased during my speech.

Let me say to my friend the member for Halton-Burlington that if the minister gets what he said as quickly as he gets a food terminal for Timmins, we are going to be a long time waiting.

I want to deal primarily and only with one

issue at some considerable length. The first question I raised in this Legislature dealt with health and safety. I have since been involved with such issues as the sintering plant at Copper Cliff where several months ago we buried our 100th victim of cancer.

Along with my colleague the member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Laughren); the former leader of this party, Stephen Lewis; and Linda Jolley from the research staff of the New Democratic Party, I was significantly involved in that whole battle that ultimately led to Bill 70. Bill 70 is there, but I want to report that it is not working well.

First, let me say to my colleagues that I appreciate the time they are giving me in this debate because I am usurping a good deal of their time. I am grateful to them for the surrender of their time because I want to put on the record carefully and precisely what we witnessed during the past 17 or 18 months.

Let me begin, however, by acknowledging the assistance of a number of people. The report I am about to present is the culmination of about 18 months of intensive effort by many groups and individuals. It represents the first comprehensive study ever to be undertaken after the implementation of the Occupational Health and Safety Act, and I am glad to be able to publicly thank the following people:

The Canadian Union of Public Employees, which provided a major amount of organizational help for some months in working with various unions and communities; the Windsor occupational safety and health group, known as WOSH, which assisted us not only in Windsor at the hearings but in many other ways; Stan Gray, whom some of you know about, of the Hamilton District Labour Council, who organized the Hamilton hearings; the unions which made their halls available, provided meals and co-ordinated briefs both from their head offices and in the municipalities we visited; the unions who helped with the massive task of transcribing the tapes from our hearings; and all those groups and individuals who made presentations, both the unorganized and the organized;

My caucus colleagues who travelled with me: the member for Hamilton East (Mr. Mackenzie), the member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Charlton), the member for Hamilton West (Mr. Allen), the member for Algoma (Mr. Wildman), the member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Laughren), the member for Scarborough West (Mr. R. F. Johnston), the member for Windsor-Riverside (Mr. Cooke), the member for Oshawa (Mr.

Breaugh), the member for Beaches-Woodbine (Ms. Bryden), Donald MacDonald, the member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy), the member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick) and, in particular, the member for Lake Nipigon (Mr. Stokes) and the member for Port Arthur (Mr. Foulds), who took my place as chairman when I was incapacitated;

From our own staff, Rose Bahr, caucus special assistant, and her staff, who looked after all our complicated travel arrangements; Linda Jolley, whose reputation as an expert in the whole field of occupational health and safety and on the act itself proved to be well deserved. She shared her knowledge and gave advice to us in full measure.

5:10 p.m.

Janis Sarra and Anne Wordsworth of our research staff not only travelled with the task force, but spent untold hours in preparation for the hearings and eventually in drafting the type of report I am about to present. They also carried out the vital job of confirming the facts—and we are attempting to do this very carefully—in all of the issues which were raised with us. Without their help this would and could not have been done.

Maria Lopez, Linda Mitchell, Sandra Ferguson and Carol Freeman contributed much time and effort in support work for this report; and Elizabeth Diehl, my assistant at Queen's Park, worked on the never-ending correspondence, the phone calls and the endless details for our visits. Finally, special thanks to the ad hoc committee of some 40 people from the field of labour and outside it who worked and encouraged our efforts on this endeavour.

Because of the facts which have emerged and the tremendous effort put forth by all, now it is my hope that the government will at last respond positively to our concerns and implement our recommendations, which will for the first time give the workers of Ontario the health and safety protection they desperately need.

The Occupational Health and Safety Act, 1978, came after a long battle by labour and the New Democratic Party. It came into existence in Ontario on October 1, 1979. After three years of experience with the act, the inadequacy of the legislation was becoming apparent to workers struggling to use the act to improve health and safety conditions in the work place.

Specific problems were presented to me, and as the occupational health and safety critic, I raised a number of these matters in the Legislature during the two sessions, September 1981 to

March 1982. Each time an issue was raised, the Minister of Labour treated the particular case as an isolated example.

In order to examine in greater depth the failures of the Occupational Health and Safety Act and to gather information from the workers with first-hand experience in trying to make the act work, in the spring of 1982 the NDP set up a task force, which I had the honour to chair, to visit major industrial centres in the province. From September to November of 1982 the task force visited 10 cities and heard more than 100 briefs and personal accounts from trade unionists and unorganized workers.

The task force held hearings in Sudbury, Thunder Bay, Windsor, London, Kitchener, Hamilton, Peterborough, Toronto, St. Catharines and Ottawa. These hearings confirmed that the problems that were surfacing were part of a much deeper pattern of difficulties arising out of the interpretation and implementation of the act across the province. The hearings also found that there was widespread dissatisfaction with the Ministry of Labour's performance in applying and enforcing the act.

The cases, which the Ministry of Labour had portrayed in the Legislature as isolated incidents, in reality turned out to be an accurate reflection of the difficulties experienced in many work places. Not only does the act fail to provide workers with any explicit right to a work place free of hazard, it does not have any stated purpose.

In 1963 the International Labour Organization defined the objectives of occupational health as "the promotion and maintenance of the highest degree of physical, mental and social wellbeing of workers in all occupations." The Ontario act has no such objective. In this respect the act reflects the government's lack of commitment to a rigorous cleanup of the province's work places and has left workers vulnerable to the economic decisions of their employers.

Workers in every city gave detailed accounts of the difficulties they faced in making the internal responsibility system work as a means of resolving health and safety problems between management and workers. Ultimately, workers had to depend on the willingness of management to institute suggested reforms. There was widespread reluctance on the part of management to accept the interpretation of the act to protect workers. When faced with an uncooperative management, workers had far too little power to make their work places safe.

When the problems were severe enough,

workers turned in frustration to the Ministry of Labour, which they often found unsympathetic and unwilling to act in response to legitimate concerns. Even when the act or the regulations clearly required management to undertake certain responsibilities, the Ministry of Labour would not use its legal clout to force the company's compliance. Clear violations of the act went unheeded by the ministry, often without so much as a slap on the wrist of the company. In the more severe and tragic cases, workers died or were seriously injured before action was taken to correct the problems.

In work places where the right to refuse to work in unsafe conditions was exercised, refusals were treated lightly by the ministry. Often the ministry did not even investigate the refusal immediately. Workers who became suspicious of chemicals being used in the plant tried to wrest information from the company on the toxic or the potentially hazardous nature of the substances. When information was given to workers, it was often incomplete, particularly in identifying the health effects of the chemicals on the workers. The difficulty in obtaining information compounded the difficulties for workers in identifying and raising specific health related issues in their plants.

The task force found that medical confidentiality does not exist in many of these plants across Ontario. The task force was repeatedly told that when company doctors or nurses examined their worker patients, the information was made readily available to management. Workers could not be sure that the information would not be used against them in their work with the company.

The recent regulations on designated substances and the provision for testing workers for symptoms of illness have created new threats to workers' rights to keep their medical problems and histories confidential. They have also sparked a new battle between workers and management to allow workers to select the doctors of their choice when medical examinations are required.

These are some of the more blatant failures of the Occupational Health and Safety Act. However, throughout the province, the task force found workers engaged in struggles to force management to establish a safe and healthy work place. Although there was a general recognition of the economic hardship caused by the recession and the resulting loss of jobs, there was never a suggestion that the fight to health and safety should be relaxed.

Although regulation of occupational health

and safety has made some forward strides in the past few years, there is a growing danger of reversing the gain. Increased unemployment and the overall economic slump put pressure on government to respond by relaxing the stand on basic worker rights under corporate pressures. Diligence must be maintained to keep a forward movement since, in reality, the needless loss of one human life because of preventable occupational illness or accident is too heavy a premium. I would like to simply indicate that the latter statement came as a result of a quote from Mr. Ron Rowbottom, occupational health and safety co-ordinator, Simcoe Can Workers' Union Local 535.

We have one recommendation with respect to this first section I have been dealing with:

1. A purpose for the Occupational Health and Safety Act must be established, such as the International Labour Organization statement, which defines the objectives of occupational health as "the promotion and maintenance of the highest degree of physical, mental and social wellbeing of workers in all occupations." Our act contains none of that.

The area that caused the workers, I guess, the most difficulty and about which I want to go on at some length is the internal responsibility system. I would like to quote Colin Lambert, the national health officer for the Canadian Union of Public Employees. When he appeared before the task force in St. Catharines, he made the following statement. "The internal responsibility became the proclaimed panacea for all problems at the work site."

Although the internal responsibility system is not defined in the Occupational Health and Safety Act, the Ministry of Labour's intent was always to use the system as the basis of the implementation of the act. Yet the mechanics of the system and its implications have never been clearly articulated.

5:20 p.m.

The ministry's Guide to the Occupational Health and Safety Act describes the internal responsibility system in this way:

"Fundamental to the act is the concept that employers and workers must share responsibility for occupational health and safety and that both must actively seek to identify hazards and develop responses to protect workers. This internal responsibility system assumes assessment of the system itself by employers and workers through the appointment of health and safety committees and representatives and through regular inspections of the work place."

Under this system, the Ministry of Labour expects workers and management to co-operate in the work place and on the joint health and safety committees to clean up the hazards—rather idealistic.

However, the task force was told repeatedly that the internal responsibility system did not work. The imbalance of power between workers and management meant co-operation and information sharing often broke down to the detriment of workers' health and safety. As long as management enjoys a monopoly over final decisions to clean up the work place, health and safety conditions can never be improved to the satisfaction of workers.

The Ministry of Labour sees its own role as a facilitator to be called upon to assist in the resolution of health and safety problems that cannot be solved by the workers and management sitting down together.

The Ministry of Labour was reluctant to intervene and management could and often did ignore the concerns of workers. Workers viewed the internal responsibility system ultimately as a way in which the Ministry of Labour could avoid its own responsibilities as enforcer of the act.

Furthermore, broad provisions or specific gaps in the legislation allow the Ministry of Labour to avoid taking a position and create irreconcilable problems for the internal responsibility system.

"The Ministry of Labour pushes an internal responsibility system whereby the company and union solve their differences and problems by themselves. It sounds good on paper, but in reality it does not work all the time. The company always has the last word: 'No.'"

I quoted that from Don Fraser of the United Steelworkers of America, Local 1005, Hamilton.

In some work places, rights that workers have been guaranteed under the act have not been recognized and the companies involved are therefore acting in direct violation of the act itself. In other cases, failure of the act to set out specific workers' rights or failure of management to co-operate beyond the precise wording of the act has led to failure of the internal system of co-operation.

Let me give some examples: First, the establishment of the joint health and safety committees.

Section 8 of the Occupational Health and Safety Act establishes the principle that each work place with more than 20 employees must have a joint health and safety committee with equal representation from workers and man-

agement. Sounds relatively straightforward, does it not?

If the objectives of the internal responsibility system could be accomplished, the work of the health and safety committees would be fundamentally important in achieving internal co-operation to resolve health and safety problems. However, even in the establishment of the health and safety committees, the task force found direct violations of the legislated procedures. The task force also found that the way in which management disregarded the health and safety committees' concerns was the first major impediment to cleaning up the work place.

Office, retail and construction workers and workers in libraries, theatres and social organizations are specifically excluded from these provisions of the act. This has meant that where employees do negotiate voluntary joint health and safety committees, they do not have the statutory powers which, under the act, guarantee access to information or the right to regular committee meetings.

In work places of less than 20 workers, regardless of the work involved, there is no automatic right to joint health and safety committees. The task force was told repeatedly that the act should be amended to establish committees in all work places.

Where there are legal rights to committees, making these rights a reality is another matter. In a submission by United Automobile Workers Local 27 in London, representing more than 4,000 workers in 24 companies, Francis Perencsik spoke of the frequency with which worker representatives are appointed by management and therefore are management-oriented.

For example, the management of Proto Canada in London initially allowed the union to appoint only one worker health and safety representative on a committee, while the company appointed the rest of the worker representatives. Since subsection 8(5) of the act specifies that half of the joint committee will consist of workers chosen by their union or by fellow workers, management does not have the right to appoint worker representatives.

In another situation in Toronto, workers faced similar problems in choosing their own appointees to the health and safety committee. At Jas. F. Gillanders Co. Ltd., a store fixture manufacturer, the company had appointed two management members to the joint committee but would allow only one worker.

The United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Local 2679, spent months

corresponding with management and the Ministry of Labour seeking to have an equal number. This right is guaranteed under subsection 8(5) of the act which states, "A committee shall consist of at least two persons of whom at least half shall be workers. . ."

In many work places, these minimum requirements of the act are adopted and two-member committees are put in place. It places the single worker in the untenable position of having to fight management alone for health and safety in the work place. The worker has no statutory right to assistance by fellow workers. The enlargement of such small committees was seen as a priority for health and safety committee members in this situation.

In terms of enforcement, there are no requirements to file with the Ministry of Labour the names of health and safety committee members. It means there is no central record of whether companies have set up joint health and safety committees or are meeting requirements of the act. Where committees are required, yet not set up, it is impossible for the internal responsibility system even to begin to work. This is particularly important in unorganized work places.

At Irwin Toy Ltd., for example, on Hanna Avenue in Toronto, where no union has yet been certified, workers have been exposed to methyl ethyl ketone, a toxic substance. Management reported to the Ministry of Labour that a joint health and safety committee was in place. However, according to the ministry's own report of May 26, 1982, the company had contravened subsections 8(5) and 8(10) of the act. The worker representatives on the committee had not been selected by the workers, and the company had never posted the names of the committee members. So much for the act.

Let me deal with a second problem workers encountered; that dealt with meetings. In practice, management often controls the health and safety committees by exerting its influence in those areas not clearly defined by the act: calling the meetings, setting the agenda, chairing the meetings and keeping the minutes. A code of practice for committees promised at the time of the enactment of the act has still not been developed. It takes a long time.

Minutes of joint health and safety committee meetings are a necessary record of complaints, problems and promised solutions to hazards, a vital part of the internal responsibility system. However, the act requires only that minutes of proceedings of committee meetings be kept.

The minutes are also supposed to be made available for examination by Ministry of Labour inspectors, but the task force was told that inspectors rarely use this record to identify ongoing hazards and violations.

5:30 p.m.

The act does not specify who will keep the minutes, whether the minutes need approval of both workers and management, or how disagreements will be resolved. The wide-open wording of the act has meant problems for workers. In the case of a health and safety committee meeting at Canadian General Electric Co. Ltd. in Peterborough, a version of the meeting prepared by John Ball of the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, Local 524, and a health and safety committee member detailed a serious incident in the plant in which a worker was overcome by toluene fumes and rushed to hospital. According to Mr. Ball's evidence before the task force, management did not believe the worker's troubles were caused by the toluene fumes and would not accept the union's typed record of the minutes. It just chose to ignore them.

Another problem is that the minutes of the meetings do not correctly reflect the concerns of the committee. In St. Catharines, Bill Craine of the Canadian Union of Public Employees, Local 1287, told the task force that controversial items have been either mentioned briefly or left out of the minutes prepared by the secretary of the committee, a management representative.

A third problem is the failure to resolve issues. The act is silent on resolution of problems through the joint health and safety committees. The result is that problems are often not resolved. There are no time limits or even requirements for management to act or respond. The committee can have access to information and identify hazards, but under the act it can only recommend improvements to the employer. From there, there is no requirement upon the employer to act on these recommendations.

Workers observed at the joint health and safety committee meetings management rarely raised issues of any significance in terms of health problems. Almost every substantial item addressed at these meetings was initiated by the workers. Since management has resources and authority to act upon the recommendations of the health and safety committee, if management does not support taking action the problem is not corrected.

Workers have stated that the ease of having a problem corrected is directly proportionate to

the cost involved. It is relatively easy, for example, to have a yellow line painted on the floor, but impossible to force management to improve the ventilation in an area where it is badly needed. Witness the Wilco situation today. The internal responsibility system consistently breaks down when management will not voluntarily undertake improvements in the work place to eliminate hazards.

Since companies resist accepting the financial costs of improvements, the Ministry of Labour should then become the final arbiter in these disputes. Where it is obvious that the act or its regulations are violated or where "every precaution reasonable in the circumstances" under clause 14(2)(g) is not taken to protect employees, the onus should be on the Ministry of Labour to force management to make improvements in the work place.

At Raybestos Canada Inc. in Peterborough, the internal responsibility system broke down completely. In November 1982, the union, Steelworkers Local 5141, withdrew its members from the joint health and safety committee to protest management's refusal to take any action on the frequent accidents in the plant. According to former health and safety committee member Ray Collet, the numerous accidents included several amputations in an 18-month period. Even the Ministry of Labour inspector, in the past year, described the internal responsibility system at Raybestos as "poor." The union has set up its own health and safety system within the plant to keep up its vigilance.

A fourth problem is management's responsibilities. The Occupational Health and Safety Act, under sections 14 and 16, directs employers to appoint front-line supervisors who are knowledgeable and responsible for the health and safety of workers, to inform workers of hazards, to provide information on proper procedures and to "take every precaution reasonable in the circumstances for the protection of the worker." This is critical to the success of the internal responsibility system if workers and foremen on the shop floor are to resolve unsafe conditions. However, there is no test of competency for supervisors, and inspectors do not require supervisors to demonstrate that they are competent and responsible as defined under subsection 1(2) of the act.

Front-line supervisors, who receive the first complaint on a work refusal, often are not trained or knowledgeable on the rights of workers under the act. This has led to failure to notify the ministry, failure to correct hazards, and the

intimidation of workers. At Allied Chemical Canada Ltd., Amherstburg, when two pipefitters refused unsafe work on August 21, 1982, the supervisor told them the act did not apply on Saturdays and refused to follow the procedure under the act. Can you imagine that, Mr. Speaker? The act does not apply on Saturdays. In some cases, front-line supervisors jeopardized their own health by doing work refused by the workers.

For the edification of members, let me put on the record a case study of what we learned at Canadian General Electric Co. Ltd. as a result of our task force. In late 1980, workers belonging to United Electrical Workers Local 537 noticed an unusually high number of their fellow workers had been diagnosed as having tumours. The workers, almost all of whom were women, worked in the small coil winding department of the CGE lamp works in Toronto. At the time, the department employed approximately 50 people.

The union brought this concern to the attention of the company in December 1980. The company doctor, Dr. Jack Richman, immediately notified the Ministry of Labour. The union also raised the issue at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the health and safety committee in January 1981. Dr. Richman indicated he would investigate and report back to the committee.

Over the next two years the union compiled a list of 24 of their fellow workers who reported to them that they had tumours, many of which were malignant. Of the 24 women, at least five died from cancer. In March 1981, Dr. Richman told the committee that "there was no abnormal incidence of cancer" and assured them that a written report would be presented soon.

For almost two years, the issue of the high incidence of cancer in the coil winding department remained on the agenda of the health and safety committee meetings. Workers repeatedly expressed concern at the delay in receiving Dr. Richman's report, and in April 1982 the minutes officially reflected the concern of the whole committee. However, because the workers on the committee had no right to compel the company doctor to produce the report, they were forced to wait until the company wished to answer their concerns.

Finally, after the local union presented this problem to the task force in September 1982, I confronted the minister in the Legislature. The company was forced by the ensuing publicity to agree to a proper epidemiological study. Dr.

Richman's report was finally given to the local president, Cathy Treacy, in October 1982, a month after her presentation to the task force.

This is very interesting: Contrary to Dr. Richman's statement to the health and safety committee in March 1981, the report revealed "a higher than expected incidence rate of gynaecological and breast cancer among the workers in the coil winding area." In company press releases of November 10, 1982, the company indicated the report had been completed in November 1981, 11 months before it was given to the workers.

The situation at CGE shows that the internal responsibility system as it exists only works when the company and the union are equally committed to making it work. Otherwise, management can ignore the concerns, even when the situation is as serious as the one I just commented on.

In this instance the Ministry of Labour was informed in December 1980 of a potentially serious situation, yet it took two full years for the union to receive vital information from the company and almost three years for a proper epidemiological study to be undertaken in this plant. Surely it must be said that both the company and the ministry have failed to make internal responsibility work.

5:40 p.m.

With that in mind we decided that we had to make certain recommendations pertaining to the internal responsibility system. They are as follows:

2. The internal responsibility system must be redefined to ensure the right of every worker in Ontario to a healthy and safe work place. This right includes the worker's right to participate the right to inspect, the right to shut down any operation that is unsafe, the right to full wage and benefit protection as a result of any medical monitoring program or during any work loss or shutdown due to health and safety problems, the right to know, the right to refuse and the right to strict enforcement of the act by the Ministry of Labour. These rights must be entrenched in the Occupational Health and Safety Act.

3. The Occupational Health and Safety Act must be amended to cover all work places in Ontario under provincial jurisdiction.

4. All work places shall have the right to joint health and safety committees.

5. A code of practice for joint health and safety committees consistent with the principles of this report shall be immediately published.

This shall include the number of workers on joint committees, departmental representation and guidelines to ensure that both union and management agree to the agendas and minutes of meetings, and guaranteed access by all workers to the information. This code of practice would require workers and management to co-chair the joint committee. Work places of 10 or more employees will have a minimum of two workers on the joint health and safety committee. In work places of less than 10 employees the health and safety committee shall have a minimum of one worker.

6. Major employers shall have committees in each large department, the numbers of which would be determined by the code of practice.

7. On construction sites the union or, where there is no union, the workers shall designate one or more worker health and safety representatives to carry out inspection and investigation functions.

8. In work places other than construction, the union or workers, in selecting the workers on the joint health and safety committee, shall have the right to designate one or more worker health and safety representatives to carry out inspection and investigation functions.

9. No worker shall suffer a loss of wages or benefits for work loss or shutdown due to health and safety problems.

10. Worker health and safety committee members and representatives shall have the right to shut down an unsafe work operation.

11. Worker health and safety committee members or their representatives shall be protected from liability if they have acted in good faith.

12. The act shall require health and safety committees to meet a minimum of once a month or at the insistence of either party.

13. Health and safety committee members or representatives shall have the right to a complete work place inspection at least once a month or at their request.

14. The act shall include an arbiter to resolve unregulated issues upon which the joint committee cannot agree. Issues covered by legislation or regulation should be strictly enforced by the Ministry of Labour.

I now want to turn to the second problem, lack of enforcement. I think one of the most interesting quotes we came across during the entire tour was by Len Belford, Brian Demers and Gloria Puckerin, Canadian Union of Public Employees Local 503 in Ottawa. They made this very interesting statement:

"If the provincial police were to enforce the highway speed limits in the same manner as the Ministry of Labour enforces the Occupational Health and Safety Act, then the only thing on the highways doing less than 150 miles per hour would be a jogger."

That sums up nicely what people think of the enforcement by the Ministry of Labour on this. Although workers acknowledged that the act has been an important step forward in the struggle for a safe work place, the effectiveness of the act has been crippled by the Ministry of Labour's lack of enforcement.

Since the act does not provide any mechanism for resolving disputes between management and labour at the level of the health and safety committee, the Ministry of Labour must exercise its authority to enforce the act if workers are to be protected.

However, the Ministry of Labour has shown great reluctance to force companies to abide by the act. Consequently, the task force was presented with many startling examples of work places where hazards have been identified and remained outstanding since the introduction of the act.

By failing to enforce its own legislation, the Ministry of Labour has given a clear signal to industry that it does not have to fear the penalties set out by the act. This has resulted in bitterness and frustration on the part of workers who believed that the legislation would mean significant improvements in health and safety. Inspection of the work place was very significant for the workers, or should I say the lack of it?

The extent to which companies are cleaning up the work place under the act is monitored by the Ministry of Labour inspectors on regular tours. When the inspector visits a plant, he is accompanied by the designated worker health and safety committee member or a representative. The inspector subsequently writes his report on the problems observed, giving either recommendations or orders for remedying the problems.

Case after case presented to the task force showed that the inspectors would not force companies to comply with either the spirit or, in some instances, the letter of the law. This was the single most common complaint in submissions across the province.

Although clause 14(2)(g) of the act makes the employer responsible for taking "every precaution reasonable in the circumstances for the protection of a worker," inspectors would not

take advantage of this broad language in the legislation to make recommendations or to write orders that would result in specific improvements. Instead, the inspectors arbitrarily limited their own ability to force the company to clean up the work place. They resorted to the most narrow and technical reading of the act and regulations to avoid writing orders or taking positions that would be unpopular with management.

For example, in the utilities department of Stelco Inc.'s Hilton works in Hamilton, two boiler operators refused to work because Stelco wanted to use an unqualified person to put one of the boilers in operation. The two experienced operators felt that that this constituted a dangerous situation for them. This is the intriguing part. Although Stelco's own rule calls for a qualified operator, the Ministry of Labour inspector called in would not uphold the work refusal because there was nothing in the act that covered this specific situation.

Testimony was presented to the task force which had raised doubts about the commitment of the ministry to enforce the act. In particular, the task force heard of the ministry's reluctance to issue orders on ventilation and hazardous substances.

A pattern emerged that clearly showed the ministry inspectors would refuse to require the company to clean up a work place by issuing orders which involved extensive costs. Not only were inspectors reluctant to write strict orders, they often overlooked outstanding hazards at the plant. Union representatives pointed out time and time again reports from the inspector that understated the gravity of certain problems in their plants or omitted significant issues raised by the health and safety committee members during the tour.

In many instances, after tours on which numerous safety violations had been pointed out, the inspector did not write down many of the outstanding hazards. Instead, the inspector would urge the union to work it out with management.

Inspectors also asked specifically at the end of each tour if there were any unresolved problems. If the union said there were, the inspector would ask whether the problems were being discussed at the health and safety committee meetings. The inspector would consider the problem resolved if the matter was before the health and safety committee. This would happen repeatedly even though the continuing appearance of certain problems on the agenda

of the health and safety committee clearly showed they were not being resolved. In this way the inspectors absolved themselves of their obligations to ensure companies would find solutions to difficult problems.

5:50 p.m.

At Rheem Canada Inc., a water heater manufacturer in Hamilton, workers of United Steelworkers of America Local 6868 employed in an area where glass-lined water heaters are being made have been exposed for more than four years to free airborne crystalline silica many times above the exposure guideline accepted by the Ministry of Labour. The initial alarm was raised in 1979 at one of Rheem's first health and safety committee meetings shortly after the introduction of the new act. In spite of modifications to the silica spray booth, and after four years of discussions with the company and the Ministry of Labour, workers are still being exposed to the high silica levels. The most recent testing in September 1982 showed levels as high as nine times the guideline. In response to the highest levels detected in the last three years, the ministry has given the company yet another year to control silica. Great stuff!

Another common complaint heard by the task force was that even when inspectors did issue orders, the orders were often simply issued, reissued and reissued by the ministry after no action by the company, without charges ever being laid against chronic violators.

In fact, according to the Ministry of Labour's most recent annual report, 71,000 orders were issued from April 1, 1981, to March 31, 1982, in the industrial sector alone. Of the 71,000 orders, 8,500 were orders that were repeated. Even when the companies involved had to be told at least twice to comply with these 8,500 orders, the Ministry of Labour prosecuted only 82 cases.

Just to give members an example, Firestone Canada Inc. is a company that has been served with numerous repeat orders. Within a one-year period, from January 1981 to February 1982, 173 orders were issued at its Hamilton plant, including many repeat orders. On a tour the ministry inspector would find a guard missing on a particular machine and write an order for that machine. On his next visit the inspector would find another machine of the same type with the same problem and write a new order. Despite repeated violations of the same nature, the inspector has been reluctant either to close down a particular machine or to prosecute for breach of the act.

Many workers described inspectors in their regions as having an anti-labour bias, which they attributed to the Ministry of Labour's hiring practices. The number of ministry inspectors drawn from the ranks of management far outweighs the small number of inspectors coming from a labour background.

Although there was widespread dissatisfaction with individual inspectors, it was recognized that the inspectors were working within a framework of legal interpretations handed down by the Ministry of Labour's legal branch. These interpretations amount to an unpublished code of practice that has been used to reinterpret crucial sections of the act. The decisions of the inspectors, in accordance with the ministry's interpretations, have stripped away rights that workers believed they had under the act.

For example, in Sudbury, ambulance workers belonging to Canadian Union of Public Employees Local 2412 were disfranchised from a joint health and safety committee because "work place" was reinterpreted in July 1982 by the regional manager of the industrial health and safety branch to mean each separate dispatch centre. There are not the minimum 20 workers required by the act at any one of these dispatch centres, so section 8 of the act does not apply.

In the case of Wilco Canada Inc., which we heard about today, the Ministry of Labour refused to lay charges against the company in London, even though the company sent letters in December 1981 to the workers who were the most militant against the excessive lead levels in the plant. I will come back to this in a case study that I will present.

In some cases the workers were not healthy enough to return to work at lower lead exposure jobs; yet the letter said: "If you do not accept this transfer, we have no alternative but to terminate your services with our company. You would not become eligible for workmen's compensation or unemployment insurance benefits." This is a letter written by the company. But there is no intimidation—never.

The ministry excused its failure to take this action regarding these letters under section 24 of the act by explaining that the workers had not exercised their right to refuse work under section 23. To quote the minister's memorandum of July 29, 1982, "It is difficult to prosecute successfully under subsection 24(1) or subsection

14(2) when an employee does not exercise his right under subsection 23(3) of the act."

Workers found they had no protection from threatening letters unless they specifically invoked section 23 of the act. This interpretation runs directly counter to interpretations made by the Ontario Labour Relations Board. For example, in a July 23, 1980, decision in Gedraitis versus Adelaide Building Services, the OLRB determined "that provision [subsection 24(1)] does not, on its face, limit its protection or application to situations where a worker has refused to perform work." Then we get a new interpretation by the legal department which rules that out.

Another problem is the enforcement of designated substances. If the enforcement of the act itself has not been rigorous, when substances have been regulated under the act, the ministry has been even less vigilant in forcing companies to comply with the regulations.

The lead regulations have been in effect since August 1981; yet the legal obligation of companies using or storing lead to produce an assessment and a control program have been ignored by many companies, often in spite of repeated orders to observe the regulations.

At the time of the task force hearings in September and October, workers across the province, from Thunder Bay, where United Auto Workers members at Hawker Siddeley Canada Inc. complained that no lead assessment had been done, to Windsor, where workers at Windsor Bumper told the same story, companies were ignoring the new regulations. When assessments had been done, they were often inadequate, with the company ignoring obligations in the regulations such as their duty to consult on the assessments with the health and safety committees.

In the case of Dow Chemical Canada Inc. in Sarnia, a one-page vinyl chloride assessment was prepared by the company's manager of industrial hygiene. This assessment gave no information on the quantities being used or stored in and around the plant. The union did not accept the assessment and called in the Ministry of Labour.

Companies which have successfully stalled in completing their assessments are not forced to proceed with the introduction of control programs. Once there is an assessment, one would assume it would go on to a control program. That is not the case in Ontario.

At Westinghouse Canada Inc. in Hamilton,

testing done in the transformer division revealed lead levels as high as 20 times the legal limit, demonstrating the urgent need to control lead levels in the paint shop. Despite two orders from the Ministry of Labour to produce a lead assessment and despite two orders to control

lead exposures in the paint shop, Westinghouse did not comply with either directive for months until pressure from the union and the Legislature finally forced the Minister of Labour to intervene personally.

The House recessed at 5:59 p.m

CONTENTS

Tuesday, April 26, 1983

Statements by the ministry

Davis, Hon. W. G., Premier:

Ontario Arts Council	171
---------------------------------------	-----

Pope, Hon. A. W., Minister of Natural Resources:

Forest management agreements	172
---	-----

Oral questions

Birch, Hon. M., Provincial Secretary for Social Development:

Nursing home care , Mr. Rae, Ms. Copps.	176
--	-----

Hospital beds , Mr. Roy.	180
---	-----

Davis, Hon. W. G., Premier:

OHIP premiums , Mr. Peterson, Mr. McClellan, Mr. Conway.	173
---	-----

McMurtry, Hon. R. R., Attorney General:

Death of Joseph Muglia , Mr. Kennedy.	179
--	-----

Pope, Hon. A. W., Minister of Natural Resources:

Lumber mill at Alban , Mr. Martel.	178
---	-----

Fishing policy , Mr. T. P. Reid, Mr. Stokes.	182
---	-----

Flood plain mapping , Mr. Ruston, Mr. Swart.	183
---	-----

Ramsay, Hon. R. H., Minister of Labour:

Buy Canadian program , Mr. Peterson.	173
---	-----

Lead assessments at Wilco-Canada , Mr. Rae, Mr. Martel.	175
--	-----

Employment of handicapped persons , Mr. Wrye, Mr. Mackenzie.	177
---	-----

Equal pay , Ms. Bryden, Mr. Wrye.	180
--	-----

Ambassador Building Maintenance Ltd. , Mr. Cooke.	183
--	-----

Taylor, Hon. G. W., Solicitor General:

Complaints against Metropolitan Toronto Police , Mr. Shymko.	181
---	-----

First readings

Missionary Church Canada East Act , Bill Pr4, Mrs. Scrivener, agreed to.	185
---	-----

Dave Holliday Limited Act , Bill Pr8, Mr. McKessock, agreed to.	185
--	-----

Coptic Orthodox Patriarchate of Alexandria, the Church of the Virgin Mary and St. Athanasius Act , Bill Pr16, Mr. Jones, agreed to.	185
--	-----

City of Mississauga Act , Bill Pr1, Mr. Jones, agreed to.	185
--	-----

Arbour Day Act , Bill 21, Mr. Kennedy, agreed to.	185
--	-----

Parking Facilities for Physically Handicapped Persons Act , Bill 22, Mr. Kennedy, agreed to.	185
---	-----

Thunder Bay United Church Camps Inc. Act , Bill Pr10, Mr. Hennessy, agreed to.	185
---	-----

Throne speech debate

Mr. J. A. Taylor	185
Mr. J. A. Reed	190
Mr. Martel	198

Other business

Members' privileges, Mr. Wrye	171
Use of time in question period, Mr. Bradley	184
Recess	208

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Andrewes, P. W. (Lincoln PC)
 Bennett, Hon. C. F., Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Ottawa South PC)
 Birch, Hon. M., Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Scarborough East PC)
 Boudria, D. (Prescott-Russell L)
 Bradley, J. J. (St. Catharines L)
 Breaugh, M. J. (Oshawa NDP)
 Bryden, M. H. (Beaches-Woodbine NDP)
 Cassidy, M. (Ottawa Centre NDP)
 Conway, S. G. (Renfrew North L)
 Cooke, D. S. (Windsor-Riverside NDP)
 Cops, S. M. (Hamilton Centre L)
 Cureatz, S. L., Deputy Speaker and Chairman (Durham East PC)
 Davis, Hon. W. G., Premier (Brampton PC)
 Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP)
 Haggerty, R. (Erie L)
 Harris, M. D. (Nipissing PC)
 Kennedy, R. D. (Mississauga South PC)
 Kerrio, V. G. (Niagara Falls L)
 Mackenzie, R. W. (Hamilton East NDP)
 Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
 McClellan, R. A. (Bellwoods NDP)
 McMurtry, Hon. R. R., Attorney General (Eglinton PC)
 Peterson, D. R. (London Centre L)
 Pope, Hon. A. W., Minister of Natural Resources (Cochrane South PC)
 Rae, R. K. (York South NDP)
 Ramsay, Hon. R. H., Minister of Labour (Sault Ste. Marie PC)
 Reed, J. A. (Halton-Burlington L)
 Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L-Lab.)
 Robinson, A. M. (Scarborough-Ellesmere PC)
 Roy, A. J. (Ottawa East L)
 Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
 Samis, G. R. (Cornwall NDP)
 Shymko, Y. R. (High Park-Swansea PC)
 Stokes, J. E. (Lake Nipigon NDP)
 Swart, M. L. (Welland-Thorold NDP)
 Sweeney, J. (Kitchener-Wilmot L)
 Taylor, Hon. G. W., Solicitor General (Simcoe Centre PC)
 Taylor, J. A. (Prince Edward-Lennox PC)
 Turner, Hon. J. M., Speaker (Peterborough PC)
 Wildman, B. (Algoma NDP)
 Wrye, W. M. (Windsor-Sandwich L)



Hansard

Official Report of Debates

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Third Session, 32nd Parliament

Tuesday, April 26, 1983

Evening Sitting

Speaker: Honourable John M. Turner

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

Contents of the proceedings reported in this issue of Hansard appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of the speakers taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is \$15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, Information Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 965-2238.



LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Tuesday, April 26, 1983

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE (continued)

Resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, before the dinner hour I was discussing the matter of Westinghouse Canada.

Mr. Boudria: Maybe you should repeat it.

Mr. Martel: I was thinking I might repeat the whole thing, but I want to be brief, so I will not. And I see the Speaker with his gavel out, so I will just continue from where I left off.

The intention of the control programs required under the regulations clearly is to force companies to keep hazardous substances at a regulated level by introducing engineering controls, work practices, hygiene practices and facilities.

Control programs, like assessments, require consultation with the joint health and safety committees. Again the role of the health and safety committee is limited to offering suggestions and recommendations. If there is a dispute, the committee has the right to call in an inspector. However, the union representatives lack the real power to ensure that their recommendations are incorporated in the final control program.

Consequently, company control programs often become solely programs of personal hygiene practices and protective equipment other than the adoption of engineering controls. Although this is contrary to the spirit of the regulations, the ministry has not acted to correct these abuses.

Because respirators and other protective devices cause considerable discomfort to employees, many workers take risks by not wearing them. Respirators also provide a false sense of security in cases where they are inadequate protection against the levels of some substances or the combination of certain substances.

For example, during an ammonia leak at the Inco Ltd. iron ore recovery plant in Sudbury on February 4, 1983, a worker was overcome by

fumes. The Ministry of Labour's own assessment on February 8, 1983, showed that the worker's respirator was approved for up to 300 parts per million for ammonia and that this respirator would be ineffective in the concentrations of greater than 500 parts per million that the worker was exposed to during the leakage. Since the company did not sound the alarm to evacuate the building, the worker continued to work, confident that his respirator was protecting him. He soon afterward lost consciousness.

Another problem with this whole area is the penalties and fines. In the few cases where violations are recognized and charges are laid by the ministry, the fines and penalties are no incentive for employers to clean up the work place. Although the act provides for penalties of up to \$25,000 or 12 months in jail or both, the average fine for a conviction under the Occupational Health and Safety Act has amounted to a little less than \$2,000.

For example, John Joseph Royal, an 18-year-old employee of Ontario Gypsum Co. Ltd., died on September 23, 1981, by falling into a mixing vat of plastering compound. The crown was able to prove management was responsible for removing the guarding over the vat to speed up production, yet the company was fined only \$1,500 and the owner \$500. This case is a tragic example of the value placed on workers' lives, a grand total of \$2,000.

In contrast to the general practice of levying small fines, a recent Court of Appeal decision upheld a relatively large fine of \$12,000 against Cotton Felts Ltd., a small Toronto manufacturing company, in a case where a worker lost his arm cleaning a machine. The court's decision to uphold this fine has been viewed as a positive signal from the courts that fines should serve as a deterrent to employers who violate health and safety laws.

Although the Ministry of Labour is not responsible for the fines set by the judges of Ontario, many workers who have seen charges laid against employers for serious accidents or deaths in their plants did not believe the Ministry of Labour pursued the companies with the kind of

thorough investigation likely to result in a serious prosecution and conviction.

After an explosion blinded employee Terry Ryan on November 19, 1979, in Westinghouse's transformer division of the Beach Road plant in Hamilton, ministry officials did a quick investigation clearing the company of any responsibility. Stan Gray, the United Electrical Local 504 health and safety representative in the plant, was dissatisfied with the ministry's treatment of the case and exercised his right under subsection 8(9) to conduct his own investigation of the accident. His lengthy report implicated the company in its handling of toluol, the flammable solvent that caused the explosion.

Because of his report, the ministry laid charges against the company. However, the charges, when they were laid, contained a number of errors, including the date of the accident. These errors would have resulted in the charge being thrown out of court if they had not been revised at the insistence of the union.

When the case finally reached the courts, it was repeatedly remanded. At the very point when union witnesses were about to give evidence, the ministry prosecutor negotiated an agreement with the company and all but one of the charges were dropped. The company pleaded guilty to a single charge and received a fine of \$5,000. The man is blind as a result of that accident.

At National Steel Car in Hamilton a young worker, André Robillard, was severely burned in a flash fire at the plant. When the Ministry of Labour refused to lay charges even though an inspector was in the plant at the time of the accident, Mike Skinner, the chairman of the health and safety committee at the time, laid his own charges. The company was fined \$20,000 on March 8, 1983, one of the highest fines levied under the Occupational Health and Safety Act. The members will note it was a worker who brought that charge.

I want to describe a case study indicating the minister's refusal really to get serious. It deals with Rothsay Concentrates, now a division of Maple Leaf Mills Ltd. Wayne McTaggart and Gary Wierts of Energy and Chemical Workers Union Local 39 are the health and safety committee members at Rothsay Concentrates in Moorefield, a company which produces high-protein feed meal. They have struggled with their company and the Ministry of Labour to get the Occupational Health and Safety Act enforced. Their submission to the London hearings illus-

trated the reluctance of the ministry to take action against chronic violators.

In January 1982 a worker believed he was instructed to climb into a feather pit and remove frozen feathers from a large beater. While he was working, the foreman, not realizing he was there, turned on the beater and the employee became entangled. He required more than 200 stitches, with deep gashes near his eye and jugular vein, and missed six weeks of work. The employer gave him a one-week suspension. A one-week suspension to the employee; is that not fine?

The Ministry of Labour inspector would not come to the accident because he did not consider it a "critical injury." Eight days after the accident, another worker exercised his right to refuse to enter the feather pit, because there was still no warning device attached to the starting system for the beater. When the inspector was called in, he initially sided with the company, suggesting to the worker it was an illegal work stoppage. Only after considerable protest by the union did the inspector retract his interpretation and issue stop work orders until the startup warning device for the feather pit was in place.

When the ministry finally did a full inspection of the plant on January 26, 1982, with the union health and safety committee representatives there, the resulting report was 17 pages of recommendations and 72 orders, including failure to put guardrails over cookers, vats and pits; failure to have functioning eye-wash fountains next to the chemicals; no startup warning devices on conveyor belts; and poor housekeeping in almost all parts of the plant, with grease, ice, parts of dead poultry and blood on the floors. During this inspection, the union pointed out hazards of 27,300-litre (6,000-gallon) chemical tanks that had been noted by the inspector since 1981; yet the inspector would not issue an order.

8:10 p.m.

Two months later, the company wrote the ministry and said 31 of 72 orders had been complied with. The union protested that the company had misinformed the ministry on more than 20 of these. The union received no response to its complaints until I raised the matter in the Legislature. When the ministry finally inspected again, the inspector refused the union's request to inspect 53 of the outstanding violations. Continuing union protest leading to further inspections produced more orders. Yet the ministry refused to charge the company.

In March 1982 another employee was injured, this time by a tallow hose which improperly had hot steam injected into it to clear a blockage. Although it was serious enough that the worker missed a month of work, it took the company 16 days to notify the union of the accident—another contravention of the act. Again the ministry refused to charge the company. Despite continued protest by the workers, the union and the New Democratic Party, the ministry has laid no charges and has demonstrated its failure to enforce its own legislation.

With that in mind, we have come up with the following recommendations which we believe the minister must introduce into the legislation if workers are to have protection. These concern lack of enforcement:

15. There shall be time limits in which management must respond to recommendations of joint committees to clean up the work place, such time limits to be enforced by the ministry.

16. There must be strict enforcement of the act by the Ministry of Labour.

17. Enforcement by the ministry of the violations shall be immediate, as in the Highway Traffic Act.

18. Time limits shall be placed on all orders.

19. Time limits shall be introduced to ensure control programs are in place for designated substances.

20. Where there are reprisals taken by a company against a worker carrying out any responsibilities under the act, the Ministry of Labour shall prosecute the employer. This shall be done in addition to any action taken by the worker to the Ontario Labour Relations Board.

21. The OLRB shall be given power to provide costs to workers bringing complaints forward.

22. When companies send letters of compliance of orders to the Ministry of Labour, they shall first secure the signature of the union to ensure their validity.

23. A coroner's inquest shall be mandatory in all work place fatalities. Workers and their unions shall be automatically allowed standing.

24. The anti-labour bias of Ministry of Labour inspectors shall be addressed through better education and hiring procedures.

25. The Ministry of Labour shall publish all interpretations of the act and its regulations immediately upon making such interpretations.

I want to move on to some of the things that have to be changed and some of the problems confronting workers in another area; that is, the right to refuse dangerous work.

The right to refuse dangerous work, as it is described under section 23 of the act, is one of the most important rights awarded to workers under the act. Section 23 gives a worker facing a hazardous job the right to refuse dangerous work, the right to have the refusal investigated immediately and the right to have the investigation undertaken in the presence of a union representative or a health and safety representative. After the company's own investigation, any further dispute over whether the job is hazardous enough to justify a work stoppage is supposed to be resolved by calling in an inspector from the Ministry of Labour.

The task force heard evidence from workers that the strength of the right to refuse dangerous work, as provided by the act, has been undercut by the Ministry of Labour's practices in handling work refusals. Consequently, many workers are finding it is not to their advantage to refuse hazardous work.

On a temporary work project in Windsor, for example, members of CUPE Local 543 renovating an old courthouse, MacKenzie Hall, began to suspect that they were being exposed to asbestos. The building had not been inspected for asbestos, although later testing showed asbestos was indeed present; nor were any of the Ministry of Labour's guidelines for the removal of asbestos being properly observed.

In an attempt to force the city of Windsor to take proper precautions, one worker, Marc Blanchette, refused to work on three separate occasions. Mr. Blanchette first refused to work on November 3, 1982, unless he was provided with a proper mask and clothing. He was sent home by his superior. He and two co-workers who also refused returned to work when they were given protective equipment.

However, two days later it was felt that the project still was not being run according to the asbestos guidelines, and on November 5, 1982, Mr. Blanchette again refused to work. A Ministry of Labour inspector who happened to be touring the building at the time did not treat the incident as a work refusal, and management sent Mr. Blanchette home again.

A third work refusal came on November 19, 1982, when workers returned to find that the foreman did not have proper protective clothing or masks available. The supervisor told the employees that they were laid off and that the job was closed down. Despite three work refusals and two Ministry of Labour orders to follow the guidelines for the safe removal of asbestos, the renovation work was never carried out in a

way that satisfied the union's understanding of the act and its regulations.

Here is another example. In Ottawa the task force was presented with an example of a situation where the Ministry of Labour would not co-operate with Canadian Union of Public Employees Local 1400 to protect the health of a worker who believed she was working under unsafe conditions. Employed by the Ottawa Board of Education, a female employee who operated duplicating machines was suffering headaches and other health problems from working in a closed room all day long. Although she did not exercise a formal work refusal, the woman had a doctor's certificate advising her to work fewer hours on the machines.

The assistance of the Ministry of Labour was requested when the board of education and the union could not resolve the problem. The inspector said it was an internal problem to be dealt with by the health and safety committee of the board in spite of the fact that a memo on the subject of spirit duplicators had been sent to the board by the Ministry of Education. The memo instructed the board to protect employees working on duplicators because liver damage could result from long-term exposure to methyl alcohol. The employee was subsequently shifted to another job, but she returned to her old job when the board replaced the duplicating machines with a photocopier.

The onus of refusal by workers in unsafe situations can also pit worker against worker. In a work refusal a steelworker at the Copper Cliff refinery in Sudbury would not work unsafely with uncapped tie rods coming out of the furnace. The refusal was at 5:30 a.m. on February 10, 1982. It took the inspector three hours to arrive. In the meantime, management sent all 10 workers in that production area home, even though they were not doing the same dangerous work. In situations such as this there is no guarantee that workers other than the worker who refused will receive lost wages because of production shutdowns from unsafe conditions.

The Ministry of Labour has been encouraging companies to treat work refusals as though an employee is merely informing the company that a hazardous condition exists. Under section 17 a worker is obliged to report an unsafe condition. Thus, many employees who refuse to work under conditions that jeopardize health find that their work refusals are not being treated as such by either the company or the Ministry of Labour. If the work refusal is treated as a report, the refusal does not have to be investigated with a health and safety representative, and the

worker may never get a decision on the dangers of a particular job.

I would like to quote the president of the Hamilton area occupational health and safety committee, Hamilton and District Labour Council:

"Inspectors have been asserting that the rights workers have under section 23 can only be exercised if there is a prior use of their responsibility under article 17," which is to report. "But the refusal right in the act is absolute, not contingent. It seems the ministry is trying to rewrite the act because it is too favourable to the workers here. At any rate, it is certainly doing a service to the employers, allowing them to circumvent the procedures set up by legislation."

8:20 p.m.

Let me give another example. A work refusal on October 15, 1982, at Aerofin Corp. (Canada) Ltd. in Gananoque confirms this interpretation. A worker refused to use coal oil to spray a machine because it would fog up the room. Although the Ministry of Labour was called in, the ministry telephoned the plant manager. The plant manager then informed the ministry that no problem existed and it was not necessary for the ministry to come in. When the health and safety representative, Bill Bolton of United Electrical Workers Local 522, called the ministry to find out why an inspector had never been called, he was told that the problem came under section 17 and that the union should work it out with management. They did not even treat it as a work refusal.

The right to refuse work in unsafe conditions is the fundamental procedure of protection a worker requires. If a worker faces reprisals such as suspension, loss of pay, demotion or job loss for refusing unsafe work, there is no protection to that worker against those sorts of reprisals.

As representatives Bill Bolton and John Lameront of United Electrical Workers Local 522 said: "To us, a serious problem with the act is that a worker can still be suspended, downgraded, disciplined or lose wages for discussing or reporting an unsafe condition to the company workers have suffered penalties and even layoffs as a result." Although employers are legally prohibited from taking reprisals against workers under section 24 of the act, workers have found in reality that they are often penalized for taking a stand over health and safety issues.

Although the act prohibits the firing of workers who have refused to do dangerous work

many workers have found themselves reassigned to menial or dirty jobs as a form of punishment. The fear of reprisals or penalties is so strong that many workers accept dangerous work although they know they should refuse. This is especially true for seasonal workers or workers still in their probationary periods who do not want to jeopardize their prospects for more permanent employment by offending their employers.

Let me give an example. In Ottawa, members of CUPE Local 503 are hired by the city of Ottawa every winter to keep the city's sidewalks free of snow. A fleet of Bombardier snow removal machines are used by the city. On at least nine occasions over the past two years, city workers have been overcome by carbon monoxide fumes as they sat in the cabs of the Bombs for up to 12 hours at a time clearing snow. All have gone to hospital for medical attention.

Despite the problems with nauseating fumes, workers would like to take out the Bombs because of fume problems do not declare formal work refusals; they do it anyway. Therefore, the mechanical problems causing the fumes have never been effectively repaired. The next worker offered the machine usually takes it out. Workers are not anxious to be regarded as troublemakers despite the fact that certain Bombs in the fleet have caused health problems for a number of operators. As I said, nine of them went to hospital.

Although section 24 was written to protect workers against reprisals, the procedures in the act for challenging reprisals leave few options. The union or the individual can take a case of reprisal to the Ontario Labour Relations Board or to arbitration. This places the onus on the worker to bring forward his or her own case and can result in a long and expensive procedure that falls on the worker. The Ontario Labour Relations Board has no authority to award costs to workers or unions for bringing the case forward, often making such actions financially prohibitive.

The Ministry of Labour may also prosecute the company that has taken reprisals. However, even if the ministry wins the case, there is no guarantee that a fired worker will get his job back. It is clear that the Ministry of Labour has not been aggressively challenging employers who act against an employee in violation of section 24. In fact, there has never been a conviction by the Ministry of Labour under this section.

The following case study illustrates this very clearly. Workers at the fabrication plant of

Dresser Industries Inc. in Cambridge have found through experience that work refusals are no guarantee that unsafe work places will be cleaned up. The workers, members of United Steel Workers of America Local 5475, make valves, gauges, cranes and, until recently, drilling rigs.

In March 1982 an inspector noted 38 lost-time accidents in a three-month period and 45 accidents in another three-month period. One inspector noted this was far in excess of anything reasonable for this type of operation.

Workers began to exercise their right to refuse unsafe work as a means of cleaning up immediate dangers in the work place. Yet they found that even rights given to them under section 23 of the Occupational Health and Safety Act, such as the right to an investigation and the right to avoid wage losses due to work refusals, were not always respected.

In May 1981 a worker refused to move a heavy load by means of a pushbutton-controlled crane because the area he was to work in was hazardous. He followed the proper work refusal procedures, but Dresser management refused to investigate and rectify the problem. Instead, the company sent the worker home and docked his pay. It required Ministry of Labour intervention, at the union's request, to reinstate his lost wages. Even then, although the inspector agreed that section 23 had been contravened, no charges were laid or orders issued about this contravention.

In November 1981, in the same company, a worker refused to work inside a crate suspended by a wire five metres above the ground. There was no safety harness and no one safeguarding the controls on the plant floor while the worker was suspended. He was threatened by his supervisor with loss of wages and he returned to the hazardous work.

In March 1982, 38 workers in the same company refused to work in an excessively smoky area of the fabrication plant where tests by the Ministry of Labour had found welding fumes levels above the Ontario guidelines of five milligrams per cubic metre and where ventilation had been found inadequate. Again, instead of following procedures under the act, management suspended the workers, all 38, and sent letters on March 12, 1982, threatening dismissal if they were to exercise their legal right to refuse unsafe work again.

The union had to take the matter to the Ontario Labour Relations Board before the company reinstated the wages. The Ministry of Labour took no action to restore the wages and

only "transmitted a message" to the company that it could not take away workers' statutory rights to refuse unsafe work. No punitive action was taken against the company for the letters threatening dismissal or for lost wages from the 38 work refusals.

In this case, workers were forced to use work refusal because of the complete breakdown of the joint health and safety committee. Yet even the work refusals did not guarantee that hazards in this plant, including concerns about welding fumes, carbon monoxide, noise, asbestos, zinc, lead, aluminum and isocyanates, were reduced. The ministry issued 82 orders in 1982 and 10 per cent of them were repeat violations. Yet the ministry never laid a charge. Days after the local made its submission to the task force, the fabrication plant was shut down and the workers indefinitely laid off.

With this in mind we can only make the following recommendations to the government through the Ministry of Labour.

26. Subsections 23(1) and (2) of the act shall be removed, thereby giving all workers the right to refuse unsafe work.

27. Workers shall be given the right to group work refusals.

28. The right to refuse shall be extended to include conditions causing stress, including assault or attempted assault.

29. Workers shall have the right to full wage and benefit protection as a result of any work loss or shutdown due to work refusals.

I want to move on to an area that caused great concern out there as we travelled. I entitled it "Workers' Right to Information." Let me quote from Don Fraser of the United Steel Workers of America, Stelco Local 1005:

"The more information and knowledge a worker has, the greater the chance of survival in the work place." That makes abundantly good sense.

The difficulties in acting effectively as a health and safety committee member or representative were compounded by the problems of acquiring accurate and useful information or, in many instances, acquiring any information at all. Let me just illustrate those.

Toxic substances: Thousands of chemicals are in constant use in the work place, yet very little information is available on the hazards of these chemicals. Although the act does include a provision that employers are obliged to provide information to assist in recognizing hazardous conditions, very little information is available on the hazards of these chemicals.

8:30 p.m.

Although the act does include a provision under clause 14(2)(a) that employers are obliged to provide information to assist in recognizing hazardous conditions, and committee members have a right to information under subclause 8(6)(d)(i), these sections have done little to ease the difficulties in obtaining information on hazardous substances.

The basic data available on any work place chemical is contained in material safety data sheets. These sheets are compiled by the suppliers of a chemical to provide employers with information on flammability and other hazards.

The law does not require employers to have safety data sheets; nor does the law require manufacturers to supply them. Where health and safety committee members or representatives tried to take advantage of their right to information under the act, they found the companies did not have the information, refused to release it or did not offer the information to their committees.

For example, in the case of International Harvester Truck Centre—now Bay City International Ltd.—in Hamilton, the workers requested material safety data sheets on the 48 questionable substances in use in their plant. The company then asked the union to list these substances and submit the list to them. The company claimed after several months delay that it did not know where to look for the information. The only information that the health and safety committee received was data sheets on half the substances, and these data sheets were provided by Du Pont Canada Inc. and CIL, two of the company's suppliers.

The onus of identifying hazards then fell squarely on the shoulders of the union or an aggressive health and safety representative or committee member. Hazards were only rarely identified by management or Ministry of Labour officials. However, even when material safety data sheets were available, these sheets were seriously limited in the kind of information they provided. Workers still needed to know the generic names, which were not given on these sheets, rather than trade names, if they wanted to search further for scientific studies on any controversial chemicals. They also needed to know the chemical constituents of any complex chemical so that chemical additives could be identified and the toxicity of any additive determined.

Because the material safety data sheets are

provided by the manufacturers of the chemical, the most serious deficiency in this information is any suggestion of the damaging long-term effects on human health, particularly after repeated exposures.

At Canadian General Electric Canada Ltd. in Peterborough—and I am sure Mr. Speaker is aware of this area—the union found the kind of information presented in the material data sheets was so minimal it could not properly assess the real dangers to human health. Four workers from UE Local 524, working with a certain kind of cutting oil, broke out with very serious skin rashes. Because the material safety data sheet on the cutting oil was so vague, the workers, although they believed the rashes were caused by the cutting oil, did not have access to more explicit information that could confirm their suspicions.

In general, there was much better access to information where the chemicals were established as designated substances, such as lead and asbestos, for which we have regulations now. In the case of both substances, workers were more aware of where these chemicals were being used in the plant and the importance of protecting workers from excessive exposure to them. However, in spite of the well-recognized hazards of both these substances, the task force found instances where foremen and supervisors still downplayed the problems with these substances.

In Cambridge, where some employees of the city were working on brake linings while others were cutting asbestos pipe for sewers without any protection, a health and safety committee member found that these workers had not received information from management about the dangers of asbestos. For those of you who read the newspapers, just last week Dr. Jim Nethercott indicated a young man had died from grinding down brake shoes which contained asbestos, and he had no protective device.

In the case of the chemical industry, workers at Dow Chemical Canada Ltd. in Sarnia explained that because of the sheer number and complexity of the chemicals in use in their industry, inspectors from the Ministry of Labour did not always have the extensive knowledge necessary easily to identify chemical problems in their plants. This meant the majority of problems identified by the inspectors related more often to violations of safety procedures than to chemical hazards.

Representatives of ECWU Local 914 at Polysar and ECWU Local 672 at Dow in Sarnia felt that

they had better access to information on the hazards of particular chemicals than most other plants in Ontario. They were supplied with data sheets by the companies and acted as unofficial clearing houses for workers anxious to obtain information on chemicals because some workers could not.

We also had an interesting presentation made when we were in Windsor documenting the community right to know. The task force also heard from several community representatives about the importance of uncovering information on toxic substances that would be available not only to workers, but to the community at large.

Because of the awesome number of toxic substances in use today, it was felt that the transportation, storage and use of chemicals which could be hazardous should be reported to city government as well as to the workers handling the chemicals. Peggy Simpson, a councillor for the city of Windsor, described her effort to draft a right to know bylaw for the city that would include requirements for disclosure on the toxicity of chemicals, on their transportation and storage, and on the need for a uniform labelling system.

Another problem in this area was the inappropriate testing and monitoring of toxic chemicals and substances. The task force was told repeatedly that one of the weaknesses of the act is the failure to guarantee that a designated health and safety committee member or representative will accompany an inspector from the Ministry of Labour or a company official while conditions in a plant are being monitored. Since either the company or the ministry make the decision about when and where to do the monitoring, the health and safety representatives feel that they must be present to observe the conditions under which the monitoring is conducted.

Many workers told the task force of situations in which inappropriate testing was done without their input. In Westinghouse Canada Inc. in Hamilton, the ministry tested for solvents in the paint shop without testing for paint particulates and lead at the same time. The ministry ignored the combination of hazards that workers would have been exposed to at the time the testing was done. Later on, the ministry chose to test for lead in the same department on a day when the type of paint being used in the company shop had the lowest lead content of any paint used by the company, rather than testing at a time when painters would have been exposed to very high

lead levels under more representative conditions at the plant.

On another occasion in the same plant, in an area where welding fumes were very dense, the ministry tested in 1982 for carbon monoxide, even though carbon monoxide was not the major hazard from this type of welding. When their tests showed insignificant levels of carbon monoxide, the ministry, in spite of the obvious problem, gave the area a clean bill of health. Later tests showed welding fumes and oxides of nitrogen above the guidelines.

In Ottawa, in response to Canadian Union of Public Employees Local 503 complaints that fumes inside the cabs of snow plough machines were sending their workers to the hospital with nausea and headaches, on March 18, 1982, a Ministry of Labour inspector investigated only one machine by turning it on for 10 minutes and testing for carbon monoxide. No orders were written on the basis of the low level of carbon monoxide detected under these conditions. The inspector did not even test the machines that were causing the workers the most serious problems and ignored the fact that the problems developed after the employees had to sit in the cabs for shifts of up to 12 hours, not 10-minute intervals.

Workers also found that they were not properly informed of the company's communications with the ministry, particularly in the areas of testing and monitoring, and that they were not always given copies of reports on testing when they were done by either the company or the ministry.

In another case, American Can Canada Inc. in Simcoe was using silica-based dusting powder, which aroused the concern of the workers using the material. The company instituted procedures for handling the powder until testing could be done to determine the levels of silica. When the testing did not occur, union officials, trying to find out why, discovered that the company had written to the minister indicating it was no longer using the product. Although the company did stop using the powder temporarily for several weeks, the company began to use the product again. Ron Rowbottom of Simcoe Can Workers' Union Local 535, using this example, stressed the need for the union to be fully informed of all communication between the company and the Ministry of Labour.

The Ministry of Labour is obliged to post any order or report and give a copy to the committee under subsection 29(6) of the act. However, where samples are collected by ministry offi-

cials, there are often excessive periods of time before the results are conveyed to the union or workers.

Library workers in Sudbury, members of CUPE Local 207, waited eight months, from September 1981 to May 1982, for the results of a sample taken by an inspector showing 50 per cent chrysotile asbestos. Yet the report was dated shortly after the samples were taken.

8:40 p.m.

Another problem is that of rights to information and investigation of accidents. When a death or critical injury occurs in a work place, the health and safety committee members or representatives are guaranteed the right to do their own investigation under the act, subsections 8(9) and 7(8). However, the definition of "critical injury" has often been used by management to bar unions from investigating accidents. Since the task force finished its hearings, a more detailed definition of "critical injury" has been published in the Ontario Gazette, and we appreciate that. It remains to be seen whether this will clear the way for workers to do important accident investigations.

For example, outside city workers in Sudbury, members of CUPE Local 6, were not allowed to investigate an accident where a sidewalk plough rolled over on a man, causing him to be off work for five months. Because the city of Sudbury did not concede that the accident was critical, the union was never notified nor allowed to investigate. Health and safety representatives repeatedly pointed out that only by doing their own investigations of these accidents can they determine the circumstances that resulted in the accident. They felt it was crucial to understand the conditions that contributed to any accident in order to avoid similar accidents. That makes sense. Although the act explicitly guarantees their right to accident reports—subsections 25(1) and 26(1)—many committee members and representatives reported that they were unable to obtain these reports without applying pressure to management.

I want to give members such an example in detail and what it means to workers. I want to deal with Ferranti-Packard Transformers Ltd. here in Toronto. In March 1980 five workers in the insulation department of Ferranti-Packard Transformers in Toronto refused to work. The workers, members of United Electrical Workers Local 525, had been unable to get information on a new insulating material called GPO-3 glastic board, which they were cutting and fitting for the inside of transformers. The work-

ers had been experiencing severe headaches, loss of co-ordination and runny eyes. The inspector who investigated the five work refusals took a sample of GPO-3 glastic board for analysis. The inspector reported the testing was done; yet the union waited and waited for the results. On October 6, 1980, seven months later, Don McMillan, Local 525 president, sent a letter to the ministry's chief hygienist asking for the information promised.

The chief hygienist responded through management to the union that the sample had been tested but the results were confidential. Is that not magnificent? The results were confidential even if it was killing them. The plant health and safety committee then directed the management health and safety co-ordinator to try again to obtain the information. He was apparently turned down again. McMillan wrote another letter on December 16, 1980, requesting the information and never received an answer from the Ministry of Labour. The right given to worker health and safety committee members under the act to receive a copy of the report was not recognized.

Our task force received a copy of this confidential information in a brown envelope after we began to investigate the matter. The report was dated March 31, 1980, the same month as the sample was taken. It states that the GPO-3 glastic board contains styrene. Styrene is a highly toxic substance which in the short term irritates the eyes, nose, throat and skin. In the long term it can cause skin disease, exacerbate chronic respiratory disease and possibly impair the liver and kidneys.

When confronted in the Legislature by this failure to give access to important information to workers, the Minister of Labour produced a communication to the union president, stating that Mr. McMillan had received the information. Yet it was dated a full nine months after the union's initial request, even though the test results were available within 25 days of the sample being taken. In any case the union never received the communication and wrote the ministry again, saying the local had never had a response to its requests for information. Why would the ministry not respond to this letter if it had released the information?

Most important, the ministry would not give access to the information on the toxic substance and it did not take any responsibility to conduct air monitoring or to order the local ventilation needed to eliminate the hazard at the source. To date, the union has been left in the dark on these

issues. I understand styrene is to become one of the substances that is going to be regulated.

With that in mind we make several recommendations to the Ministry of Labour with respect to workers' rights to information.

30. Health and safety committee members or representatives must be present when all testing or monitoring is done to ensure that proper procedures are being followed under representative working conditions.

31. Health and safety representatives shall have the right to do their own testing and monitoring and the right to bring in their own experts for the same purpose.

32. Health and safety representatives shall have the right to be notified and participate in any accident or safety or health-related investigation.

33. In addition to posting inspection orders, copies shall be given to the union representatives representing the workers.

34. Companies must forward copies of all monitoring reports and copies of all correspondence between them and the ministry to members of the health and safety committee in their union.

35. Labelling requirements shall be implemented on all chemicals in the work place so that the containers readily display chemical compositions and generic names, handling precautions and associated hazards.

36. Safety data sheets will be standardized with trade name, generic name, chemical composition and quantity, physical data, handling information, associated health hazards, including results of short-term, animal and epidemiological testing done.

37. The Ontario government shall ensure access to health and safety information, particularly material such as safety data sheets, inspectors' reports, assessment and control programs as required by the designated substance programs and testing reports.

38. Workers must have the right to generic names and chemical composition of substances in use in their work places. Workers shall have the right to all the information recommended in No. 33 on safety data sheets.

39. Companies shall have no right to market or use products if they will not give full disclosure of chemical use and file the information in a central registry. Information which companies call trade secrets, patent rights or proprietary rights shall not take precedence over health of workers.

40. A copy of the act, paid for by the

employer, shall be given to every employee and supervisor and the act shall be made available in other languages.

41. There shall be a community right to information so people know what toxic chemicals are being used, stored or transported in their community.

We have another serious problem on which there was a whole royal commission just several years ago launched by the Ontario government with respect to medical confidentiality. It was called the Krever royal commission. This is being violated terribly. Let me quote from Teena Flood, whom my friend might know, of the United Electrical Workers Local 524, Canadian General Electric Co. Ltd., Peterborough. She says, "Medical monitoring is being substituted for work place monitoring. Workers are still being used as guinea pigs to detect work place chemical hazards."

Medical monitoring refers to the practice of gathering information on workers' health. This monitoring includes not only pre-employment physical examinations, but also more specialized examinations that reflect exposure of workers to toxic chemicals. Because of the sensitive issues involved in the practice of medical monitoring, such as confidentiality of medical records, many workers are insisting on strict agreements as a condition of their co-operation with monitoring programs.

CUPE Local 1348 in Windsor has referred its union's objections to pre-employment medical examinations required by the Essex County Board of Education to the Ontario Human Rights Commission. Prospective employees of the board have been asked questions related to the mental health of their families. The union has argued that such inquiries are not job-related considerations and are insulting to the dignity of the person undergoing the medical. The board has also been using its doctors for these examinations rather than allowing prospective employees to consult their own doctor.

8:50 p.m.

Many workers also expressed concern that the confidentiality of medical records was not being respected. Medical monitoring was seen as a way in which employers could obtain information on workers that could later be used against them in claims before the Workers' Compensation Board.

As Ken Glassco of ECWU Local 914, of Polysar Ltd. in Sarnia said to us, "The use of extensive medical monitoring leaves no doubt in my mind that information of this type is not

only used for monitoring the work place and our bodies, but could be used as a detriment to the wellbeing and health of the workers."

Where the company has its own doctor or nurse on staff, workers regard the medical staff as employees of the company, representing the interests of the company and not the workers.

Workers also felt the medical monitoring shifted attention from the hazards in the work place to the worker. In certain plants monitoring the workers was used as a substitute for monitoring the work place. This would result in companies removing individual workers from jobs involving the use of hazardous substances when the workers showed signs of damage, such as lead poisoning, instead of taking measures to remove the hazard.

In another situation, at Canadian General Electric Co. Ltd. in Peterborough, workers in an area of the plant where silver soldering was done were exposed to cadmium as a result of the soldering. According to health and safety committee member Teena Flood, these workers were monitored for cadmium in their blood. However, this test is of little or no value in indicating environmental exposure, which is really the culprit in the whole scene.

This is also consistent with the way in which employers respond to evidence of unacceptably high levels of toxic chemicals or physical hazards. As a substitute for proper controls, employers have, instead, engineered the workers to suit the environment by insisting on the use of personal protective equipment such as ear plugs or respirators, rather than cleaning up the problem.

Another section I want to deal with is the controls program. The regulations on designated substances, such as lead, provide another avenue for collecting information on the health of workers. The new regulations require, in addition to monitoring levels of these substances in the work place, that workers be tested for exposure to these chemicals. A key issue for workers in submitting to these monitoring programs is the question of who does the examination.

At Aerofin Corp. (Canada) Ltd. in Ganaoque, UE Local 522 has resisted the company's efforts to require workers to use the services of a doctor chosen by the company to monitor blood lead levels. The union has been successful in its efforts to allow workers to be tested by a doctor of their own choice. They are searching for a doctor who will keep their medical records confidential and who will simply advise the

employer whether a worker is fit, fit with limitations or unfit, as the regulations require.

As part of the Ministry of Labour's interpretation of the act for use by its inspectors, the ministry's legal department has prepared a letter to a company which asked for an interpretation on the issue of who does the medical monitoring. This letter indicates the intention of the regulation was that the physician be a company physician. While the ministry is attempting to interpret the act in favour of companies, as John Lameront and Bill Bolton of UE local 522 told the task force: "Law is determined by what the act and regulations say, not what the authors may have intended. Nowhere do the act or the regulations say 'company physician.' They only say 'physician' or 'examining physician.'" The workers are having great difficulty with that.

I want to deal with workers' clinics in relation to all this. The best medical treatment we found for workers was the assessment, treatment and counselling which has been done by the Hamilton Workers Occupational Health Clinic. Doctors at the clinic not only have the specialized expertise to deal with occupational health and disease, but they also have provided medical care which serves the needs of the workers, not companies.

The clinic does not receive any provincial funding other than the medical claims processed through the Ontario health insurance plan. The bulk of the funding is from United Steelworkers Local 1005. In addition to treatment, the clinic has worked as an advocate, identifying hazards in the work place. In some cases, the clinic has been instrumental in having dangerous chemicals replaced by less toxic substances.

Despite the valuable work undertaken by the clinic, both the Ministry of Health and the Ministry of Labour have been reluctant to fund worker-controlled clinics. Since they would provide both medical treatment and preventive care in a specialized way, these services are a desirable alternative to company doctors. We, therefore, make a number of recommendations with respect to medical monitoring.

42. Medical monitoring shall be voluntary, not mandatory.

43. Workers who choose to undergo medical testing have the right to a doctor of their choice.

44. Medical monitoring must be paid for by management.

45. Medical monitoring must be work-related.

46. All medical information must be kept

strictly confidential unless a worker approves release of the information, and the information should not be used by the employer in any way that could affect the employee-employer relationship. General pre-hiring medical release forms now required by companies should be made illegal.

47. Independent occupational health clinics shall be established in every major industrial city and shall be funded collectively by employers. These clinics shall be worker-controlled.

I thank my colleagues for sending this fresh aqua over here.

I would like to turn next to the regulation of toxic substances and work place hazards. The Occupational Health and Safety Act sets out the framework and the general policy for health and safety in the work place. The regulations issued under the act were to provide the working tools for enforcement. There are two types of regulations: those covering particular sectors—industrial, construction and mining—and those covering toxic substances and other physical hazards.

Submissions to the task force raised concerns about the inadequacies of the regulations in place, the enforcement of the regulations and the failure of the government to move quickly enough to regulate in other areas.

There are currently over 25,000 known toxic substances in the work place and more than 500 new substances are introduced annually. Yet to date, the Ontario government has regulated only five designated substances: asbestos, mercury, lead, vinyl chloride and coke oven emissions. The government is in the process of designating silica, noise and isocyanates and has given notice of eight others to be regulated under part X, paragraph 41(2)(14) of the act.

Deficiencies in the regulation process: The regulation process is slow and complicated and ultimately fails to protect workers by not requiring the elimination of the hazard.

Essentially, the process takes place behind closed doors. While a single public meeting has been added towards the end of the designation process, the fact that the regulation is not provided before the meeting and the way in which the meeting is conducted essentially stifle any serious debate.

The ministry has no obligation to publish a written justification for the actual standards it sets, and while it is clear that cost-benefit considerations of some kind do enter into the deliberations, there has been no open discussion or justification for them.

The ministry argues that the Advisory Council on Occupational Health and Occupational Safety provides the format for the necessary review by all parties. However, its mandate does not include the evaluation or alteration of the actual levels set or any requirement in the standard. The result is that the regulatory system lacks accountability, to the detriment of workers' health.

In 1978-79 the Ministry of Labour issued a priority list of 52 biological and chemical substances and physical agents to be regulated; yet the ministry has fallen far behind on its proposed schedule to regulate many hazardous substances, despite pleas by the unions. The result is that thousands of substances used daily across the province are unregulated by any government legislation.

I want to deal with unregulated substances. Unregulated substances fall into two categories: those subject to exposure guidelines and those that have no guidelines for their use at all. For workers, even the guideline approach adopted by the ministry has often proved to offer little or no protection from harmful substances.

First, the guidelines are not enforceable by law. Second, the process by which the guidelines are set is both confusing and suspect.

9 p.m.

Without the ability to enforce guidelines for so many substances, workers find the guidelines are almost useless. For instance, workers who had fought for protection against asbestos before it became a regulated substance appeared before the task force in Windsor. In this case, a Windsor Board of Education employee was exposed to asbestos and alleged that management had failed to inform him of the hazards or to provide him with personal protective equipment.

CUPE Local 27 charged the Windsor Board of Education under the Occupational Health and Safety Act. The judge ruled that since there were no asbestos regulations he could not judge whether the worker's health had been jeopardized. The decision of this case was a major setback for workers exposed to unregulated substances.

The implication for other workers is clear. With only five regulated substances, they are left with little protection from exposure to many toxic chemicals.

In a case presented to the task force, workers at Canadian Trailmobile Ltd. in Brantford had been exposed to isocyanates for more than 12 years. Testing over the past few years has shown

exposure to the substance in the foam insulation spraying operation to be above the guideline of 0.02 parts per million set by the ministry.

Initially, workers were not given any protection from the substance. Then, under pressure from the union, the company provided personal protective equipment—described by the Ministry of Labour, by the way, as “primitive”—in the form of plastic bags over the workers' heads with an attached air hose. Workers suffered respiratory problems and one 1980 ministry test showed 10 of 35 workers with lung dysfunction abnormalities. Yet the company was not charged, nor is it likely to be charged because there is no regulation on isocyanates. In the absence of regulation, the company cannot be forced to provide either proper ventilation or, at the very least, effective personal protective equipment approved by the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health. Only through the aggressive efforts of the UAW have gains been made in this area.

The other major problem with the guidelines is the way in which they are set. Submissions to the task force expressed many frustrations over the fact that the Ministry of Labour is changing the terms and method of measuring toxic substances in the work place. The result has been confusion for labour, management and even the ministry's own inspectors.

Under clause 20(8)f) of the act, intended for the control of toxic substances, the ministry issued in 1981 a discussion booklet called *Exposure Criteria for Potentially Harmful Agents and Substances in the Workplace*. The booklet, known as the yellow booklet, will form the basis for exposure levels of toxic substances. Yet it is overly complex and fails completely to identify those substances which are known or suspected carcinogens. The booklet assumes that there is an acceptable level of risk, an approach which implicitly acknowledges that workers will experience health effects at levels below those set out.

The real confusion comes when trying to determine exactly how the ministry intends to set guidelines or regulations. On the one hand, it seems to have reverted entirely to using “threshold limit values” produced by a private American group called the American Conference of Governmental and Industrial Hygienists while at the same time using the term “time-weighted average exposure limits” to describe its approach.

On the other hand, the ministry has introduced a new element of confusion by its method of measuring exposure limits. Rather than meas-

uring substances over an eight-hour work day, as required when using TLVs, the ministry has moved to measuring them over a 40-hour work week. The result has been the mystification of data given to workers by ministry inspectors, doctors and hygienists and a lack of clear enforcement.

In his submission to the task force, Dr. Jaime Meuser of the Toronto Occupational Health Resource Committee criticized the ministry's introduction of time-weighted average exposure limits:

"The eight-hour TWA limit used by the ACGIH and other standard-setting agencies is difficult enough to enforce. The ministry has made enforcement even more difficult by opting for a 40-hour time-weighted average limit or criterion. . .

"Given that the burden of proof in prosecution for noncompliance lies with the crown, the ministry has saddled itself with the onerous task of collecting enough evidence to prove that the average exposure over the course of an entire week has exceeded the limit. It would be simpler to base exposure limits on the same principles that underlie the breathalyser principles of the Criminal Code. In these, evidence of noncompliance is strictly defined in terms of threshold reading."

The guidelines in the yellow booklet are under public review. But promises by the ministry to hold public meetings on the levels proposed in the booklet have been delayed for months, and even when they are held labour is not necessarily included. In the case of one meeting held on polychlorinated biphenyls, industry was notified but the Canadian Union of Public Employees, CUPE, whose Hydro workers are exposed to PCBs probably more than any other group, was not notified. Colin Lambert of CUPE, in his submission in St. Catharines, stated:

"It is just an illustration of the contempt and depth of anti-labour feeling of the occupational health branch. We suggest that they would not treat the International Nickels, the Stelcos, the Ontario Hydros or any of the employers in this province in a similar fashion." When workers have been asked to make presentations at meetings reviewing the guidelines in the discussion booklet they have had difficulty in obtaining or have been refused the supporting documentation commissioned by the Ministry of Labour.

In St. Catharines, a submission by United Auto Workers Local 199 gave further evidence

of the ministry's dubious approach to reviewing the guidelines. In an appeal on an order resulting from a work refusal by a General Motors of Canada Ltd. worker in St. Catharines, the director of the ministry's occupational health branch ruled that the time-weighted average exposure level for PCBs should be 50 times the level proposed in the ministry's discussion booklet.

He set this level after receiving scientific evidence from General Motors and after carrying out a telephone survey of major industrial users of PCBs. The survey indicated the current levels of exposure in industry and what was reasonably achievable. The director then selected the highest of these levels, five times higher than the level of exposure achieved at the GM plant, and rescinded the original order against the company. So even where an exposure criterion is proposed, it is subject to reinterpretation by the ministry, based on what industry wants.

Let us look at another problem: noise. Despite the promise to regulate noise, the Ministry of Labour has never acted to curb workers' exposure to excessively high noise levels. As a result, hundreds of workers have been victimized by industrial deafness. I would just like to digress to tell the House that all the experts in this province will tell members that there should not be one person suffering noise-induced deafness in this province, not one, and we have them by the thousands.

According to testimony presented to the task force by John Lennie from United Steel Workers of America Local 1005, even one case of industrial deafness is one case too many since industrial deafness is a totally preventable problem. Although the Ministry of Labour has considered setting 90 decibels over an eight-hour period as the exposure limit, Mr. Lennie argued that even much lower levels could cause problems for workers. Many workers complained that no attempt was made to limit the noise in their plants. Instead, workers were forced to wear ear plugs or muffs to protect their hearing, a practice which can cause infections for many workers.

Even though noise could be successfully engineered to a minimum, there was no attempt by companies to use techniques such as spreading machines out over a larger area or using building materials to absorb sound. For example, in a new spike mill at Stelco's Hilton works where noise could have been engineered down to acceptable levels, the noise in the new mill consistently registered over 100 decibels, a level

bound to damage the hearing of workers in the plant.

I want to turn to another problem on my list: cancer. I want to quote Don McMillan of United Electrical Workers Local 525, Toronto: "When it comes to a carcinogen there is no 'socially acceptable risk,' as the Minister of Labour would have us believe. We are tired of their body counts." As I said this afternoon, just recently in Sudbury we buried the 100th man from the sintering plant. There is no level—and without government interference it is going to continue.

9:10 p.m.

There are 111 known human carcinogens, according to the International Agency for Research on Cancer, and a further 100 suspected carcinogens based on animal tests. Yet of the designated substance regulations, only three regulate cancer-causing agents in Ontario. Where there are regulations, they do not advocate substituting less dangerous substances for cancer-causing chemicals.

Workers continue to be exposed to dozens of cancer-causing substances, about which they have no information because of trade secrets. Workers have no protection because these substances are not regulated. They have no choice but to work because they need their jobs.

Heather Webster of the Amalgamated Clothing and Textile Workers' Union told the task force that most textile workers are not aware that the benzidine dyes they commonly use are a leading cause of bladder cancer. The textile workers have unsuccessfully tried to get the minister to regulate benzidine and to require substitution of less hazardous chemicals.

The advisory council on occupational health and occupational safety recently has proposed a cancer policy for Ontario. While the requirement for premarket testing of any new chemical and the testing of all chemicals now in use is essential for the protection of workers, the notion of setting acceptable levels for carcinogens is unacceptable. There are no acceptable levels. Just as in the designated substance regulations, workers in Ontario are denied the right to an open justification of safe levels.

The issues at stake are basic human values. Workers have a fundamental right to participate in the decision and to have the decision justified to them. To move the decision into the realm where only scientists and economists can participate is fundamentally undemocratic. It also, by the way, jeopardizes health.

Those making submissions to the task force demanded clearly that the government require premarket testing of all new chemicals. Michael Hutsulak of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners Local 2679 urged that the government clearly prohibit the introduction of any new carcinogen into the work place.

Less dangerous chemicals should be required to be substituted for cancer-causing substances wherever possible. Independent short and long-term animal testing must be undertaken instead of the current testing by manufacturers who stand to profit. Chemicals now in the work place should be categorized and workers should have full access to that information. Most important, there needs to be an immediate generic cancer regulation that protects workers against known carcinogens until such time as they are fully regulated.

Labour has presented an alternative regulatory strategy for the testing, classification and removal or control of all toxic substances, physical agents or work processes. Fundamental to their approach is the assumption that all chemicals and physical agents are guilty until proven innocent through independent testing.

Each employer should be required to provide a written inventory of all chemicals, physical agents and work processes, complete with chemical formulations, generic names, amounts used and workers exposed, to the Ministry of Labour and to be posted in the work place to ensure that every worker has the right to know exactly what he or she is exposed to at work. From a set date, each employer would need to notify the ministry and its workers of any intention to introduce a new chemical agent or work process and fulfil all of the testing requirements and control measures before the substance is introduced.

All new chemicals would have to be thoroughly tested in short-term and long-term animal testing and then classified as to their potential carcinogenicity before they are allowed into the work place. Where new chemicals are found to produce positive results in any of the tests, they would be classified as confirmed or suspected carcinogens and would not be allowed to be introduced into any work place. All chemicals currently in use should be thoroughly tested and classified within five years, and any chemical found to be cancer causing in humans, or suspected of causing cancer in animals as a result of short-term testing, would be immediately controlled to no detectable level until such time as a safely tested substitute is available.

All testing would be carried out by independent testing facilities or by approved international agencies and the cost must be borne by those employers or groups of employers who wish to use the substance.

Overseeing this approach would be a permanent committee comprised of a majority of labour representatives who would approve all the testing requirements, the classification system and any exemptions to the elimination or control strategy. A labour majority can assure that decisions are made by those who assume the most risk.

A generic approach to the testing, classification and elimination of cancer-causing agents in our work place provides an automatic system which would avoid the time-consuming process that the designation of individual substances involves. There are no lengthy debates about the extremely controversial and value-laden approach of risk assessment, cost-benefit analysis or the establishment of what some call "acceptable levels of risk." There is just no debate about how much cancer is too much, since the purpose of the regulatory exercise is surely to prevent all cancer in the work place.

I want to deal also in a similar vein with the reproductive hazards, and I want to quote Shelly Acheson of the Ontario Federation of Labour women's committee.

"By failing to identify and control our exposure to hazardous work place conditions, we not only risk our own health but we are gambling with the health of future generations."

The National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, NIOSH, has identified 1,800 chemicals associated in one or more studies with reproductive abnormalities which affect workers' ability to have healthy children. In its submission to the task force, the Ontario Federation of Labour women's committee expressed great concern over the thousands of other chemicals, processes and conditions of work which may pose dangers to reproductive health but which are completely unknown.

Shelly Acheson told the task force that the Ontario government's policy on reproductive hazards excludes women from employment in higher paid industrial jobs. For example, the lead regulation requires male workers to be removed from exposure at 0.70 milligrams per litre of blood lead levels. Men are deemed fit for exposure and must return to work when their blood lead count drops below 0.5 milligrams per litre. Yet women capable of bearing children

are required to be removed at 0.4 milligrams per litre, and if a woman is pregnant she is to be removed immediately.

These measures—removing the worker instead of the hazard—serve to exclude women from employment in higher paid industrial jobs. They also penalize men by exposing them to greater risks of reproductive and blood damage. The American standard removes both men and women from exposure at blood lead levels of 0.4 milligrams per litre, a level that workers in Ontario have demanded as a first step. However, workers agreed the long-term goal should be to eliminate exposure for all workers to substances such as lead.

Genetic screening programs are another tactic of industry to hire "healthy workers" instead of cleaning up the work place. Evidence of this in Ontario is hard to find, but the Institute of Industrial Relations in California has published evidence that Dow Chemical Co. in Texas has for 10 years conducted pre-employment testing and blood analysis to screen out workers with genetic damage or a chromosomal susceptibility to damage. Remove of "high risk" workers is no substitute to cleaning up the work place, and the Ontario government has not investigated employment and medical monitoring procedures to ensure this is not happening.

Just as the government needs to move immediately to identify carcinogens and legislate a generic regulation, it also needs to test for the other harmful effects of chemicals. This would include a chemical's ability to cause birth defects or genetic changes. Generic regulations are needed for all substances that can cause reproductive damage as a stopgap measure to protect workers and their children.

In our report we make a number of recommendations in this area.

48. Every effort must be made to reach a "no exposure" level on any substance not proven 100 per cent safe. The burden of proof that there are no adverse health effects shall rest with the manufacturer.

49. There must be premarket testing of all chemicals and testing of all chemicals on market.

50. Current guidelines for limits of exposure that are being regulated shall be considered a minimum requirement, with the goal to be reducing the exposure to zero.

9:20 p.m.

51. We support the Ontario Federation of Labour's cancer policy paper, including the

following: premarket testing and classification of new chemicals and of all chemicals currently in use; those classified as carcinogens or potential carcinogens by short-term or animal tests should be removed from the work place and replaced with safer products. Until such time as this removal is possible, companies and employers shall decrease exposure to no detectable level.

52. There must be a generic cancer regulation to protect workers against exposure to any carcinogen.

53. There must be a generic regulation to protect workers against reproductive hazards.

54. The government must move quickly to introduce the long-promised regulation for health care and education sectors.

I want to deal with worker education as a problem we encountered. I want to quote David Christopherson of United Auto Workers Local 525, Hamilton:

"We see a world of difference in the plants where the act has been studied and an attempt made to enforce it and those plants where workers are struggling along, not even aware of their rights on the job."

The Occupational Health and Safety Act clearly places the responsibility for carrying out key provisions of the act such as inspecting the work place, identifying hazards and investigating accidents on the shoulders of the workers. However, the act makes no provision to ensure that workers are properly informed of their rights and responsibilities as described in the act.

Clause 17(1)(a) states that a worker shall work in compliance with the provisions of the act and regulations. Yet the only guarantee that a worker will have access to the act is the provision under clause 14(2)(h) which requires companies to post a copy of the act in every work place.

Even this guarantee has not been met by employers such as Windsor Bumper, where at the time of the task force hearings the company still had not posted a copy of the act, three years after its introduction, "on any wall in the plant" that the workers could find. In another case that illustrates the difficulties workers face in learning the act, Stelco provided only one copy for over 300 workers in part of their massive Hilton works operation.

Many workers paid tribute to the Ontario Federation of Labour for its highly successful training courses which the majority of health and safety committee members and representa-

tives appearing before the task force had taken. The OFL's 30-hour certification program has been a key factor in making workers aware of their rights and in teaching them how to use the act effectively in their work place. Because the course is taught by health and safety representatives who have taken a specialized teaching course, also run by the OFL, and who volunteer their time to teach, a large number of workers have had access to valuable training.

However, despite its success, the OFL's training program does not have guaranteed funding and operates from year to year by applying for provincial lottery funds and a Ministry of Labour grant. On a minimal budget of \$1.3 million for the last three years, the OFL has trained more than 4,000 students.

In contrast—and you will appreciate this, Mr. Speaker—the well-funded training programs of the nine accident prevention and safety associations were not regarded as useful by workers. The accident prevention and safety associations' educational programs are funded out of the Workers' Compensation Board assessment of companies operating in the province and received in 1982 over \$27 million. Compare \$1.3 million to the OFL for three years on an ad hoc basis and \$27 million in one year alone to the accident prevention and safety associations. It boggles the mind, to say the least.

Workers appearing before the task force described the associations' courses as management-oriented programs which emphasize the carelessness of workers as the cause of accidents. If members do not believe me, I would ask them to look at any ad run by the accident prevention and safety associations on television on any given night and they will see that the workers are dumb slobs who manage to get hurt. Just look at them. I ask my colleagues to look at them. They are deplorable.

Most workers did not feel those courses offered by the accident prevention and safety associations made any contribution to their knowledge of the act.

Many workers who have been trained in health and safety by the Ontario Federation of Labour have returned to their plants to find that management, supervisors and even their fellow employees do not know either their responsibilities or their rights under the act. This has led to confrontations between management and health and safety committee members and representatives, trying to establish such rights as the right to refuse dangerous work or the right to investigate accidents, and foremen who either do not

understand or who do not want to recognize their obligations under the act.

Many examples were cited to the task force of violations of the act; for example, foremen who do not call in the health and safety representative or the ministry where a worker has exercised his right to refuse to work under unsafe conditions. There are foremen who violate the act by ordering other workers to substitute for a worker who has refused a dangerous job. That is contrary to the act.

At Union Carbide in Welland, where workers are represented by UE Local 523, a worker's right under subsection 23(4) to call in a health and safety representative or committee member to investigate a work refusal was challenged by management representatives who apparently did not know the procedures set out under the act. When an employee refused to use an air hammer under conditions he considered unsafe, the foreman challenged the worker's right to have the health and safety representative called in. The issue was resolved only because of the persistence of the health and safety committee member who knew the act and who threatened to call the Ministry of Labour if the foreman did not co-operate.

Several submissions also raised the need for education of immigrant workers in their first language. Heather Webster of the Amalgamated Clothing and Textile Workers Union spoke at the task force hearing in Toronto of the difficulties that textile workers, many of them immigrant women, face in understanding their rights in the work place because of language problems.

The Ministry of Labour has not produced copies of the act in any language other than French or English, and there are virtually no health and safety courses in major languages such as Italian, Portuguese, Chinese or Greek.

Workers' knowledge of health and safety and their rights under the act should be developed not only through special training courses, but should also be an integrated part of the provincial education system. Teach it where it counts, and that is when they are young.

We make some recommendations with respect to worker education.

55. The act shall ensure that all union health and safety representatives complete the Ontario Federation of Labour's certificate program within a specified time of their election or appointment to a health and safety committee.

56. Education of all workers will be undertaken with the employer paying lost-time wages and

shall be available in the language spoken in the work place.

57. The Ministry of Labour must ensure a system of training for supervisors, including a requirement to certify competence as required under the act.

58. Mandatory health and safety training is urged for the public school system for all students using a curriculum approved by representatives of labour and management.

59. An amount of money equivalent to the amount currently allocated to the accident prevention and safety associations shall be given to a worker health and safety association run by the OFL to train workers, both organized and unorganized.

I want to deal with those who are not included in the act, the exclusions, because they are in difficulty.

Let me quote from a home worker in Toronto dealing with fabrics: "The most difficult fabrics are the velours. The nap comes off and gets all over everything in the house and the air is filled with it. The dust from the fabric is very fine; the consistency of flour. If I am sewing with velour fabric, my nose begins to run blue. My doctor says it's no good for me to sew this material, even though I am taking allergy shots, but I need the money. Now I usually tie a handkerchief mask over my nose and mouth when I am sewing."

This statement, quoted in a submission to the task force, exemplifies the health problems confronted by workers excluded from the act. These workers, including farm workers, home workers and teachers, have absolutely no legal protection against hazards in the work place.

Farm workers: Mutale Chanda of the Canadian Farmworkers Union told the task force of serious health problems facing the 50,000 full-time and 100,000 seasonal farm workers in Ontario. Farm workers face increasing hazards from exposure to pesticides sprayed on vegetables and fruits. I do not have to remind the members of the dramatic case we heard about in Toronto during the winter and the operations to try to save that man's life.

9:30 p.m.

Yet those workers have no right of access to information on the health effect of pesticides or on the proper handling procedures. Women tobacco pickers experiencing numbness in the hands complained to the Ministry of Labour and were told that the ministry had no mandate to investigate pesticides. That is a sad commentary on Ontario in 1983.

Other legislative restrictions prohibiting the organizing of farm workers into unions mean that farm workers cannot even negotiate health and safety protection into contracts, nor can they be protected by a union.

In an increasingly automated industry accidents are becoming more commonplace. At Wellington Mushrooms Ltd. in Picton, the mushroom farm is an assembly-line operation, and work is performed indoors year-round. Yet the Ontario Labour Relations Board ruled in 1980 that the operation was still farm work since the workers handled soil in the farm warehouse.

Gary Cwitco, representing the health and safety committee of the Labour Council of Metropolitan Toronto, spoke of the exclusion from the act of farm workers and other workers. He told the task force of assurances by the Ministry of Labour at the time the Occupational Health and Safety Act was passed that farm workers would be included.

It was recognized that farm work is one of the most hazardous occupations in this province—just look at the Workers' Compensation Board statistics and you will see. We were assured by the ministry that it was just a matter of time until the regulations were developed to include farm workers.

Well, it has been four years and it still has not happened, and that needs to be changed. When you have sectors of the economy excluded from the law, that certainly does not allow workers to have equality in the law. Cwitco recommended that there should be no categories of workers excluded by the law.

Let me deal with teachers for a moment. Teachers and their representative federations were initially excluded from the legislation at their own request, yet many found they had abdicated rights that were necessary to their good health in the work place. In several cities, teachers made submissions to the task force expressing concern that they had been excluded.

In Toronto, the Federation of Women Teachers' Associations of Ontario, representing 30,000 elementary teachers, outlined their three-year struggle since the act's inception to be brought under the Occupational Health and Safety Act. Hazards faced by teachers include exposure to communicable diseases such as lice, exposure to poor ventilation and exposure to toxic substances in art rooms, science rooms, industrial shops and duplication areas.

The Ontario Public School Men Teachers' Federation raised, among other issues, stress-related illnesses from increased class sizes and

the changing nature of education—for example, mandatory special education. To quote: "Heart disease, ulcers and nervous breakdowns are three of the most common symptoms (of stress). Over the last five years the incidence of members suffering emotional breakdown has increased by about 25 per cent each year."

Almost every submission made to the task force by teachers raised the unknown dangers of work with video display terminals, which are increasingly common in the education system.

Home workers, people who do their work at home, are also excluded from the act. In a submission to the Toronto task force hearings, Laura Johnson from the department of sociology at the University of Toronto, the author of *Seam Allowance*, pointed out the hazards of working in the home, including poor ventilation and stress created by long hours and the double load of simultaneously caring for children and working. An estimated 7,500 people are doing home work in Ontario, most in the garment industry.

The effects of textile work in industrial settings are well documented, but the potential hazards and incidence of respiratory diseases associated with garment work in the home are unknown, including the potential hazard to children and other family members. Health and safety inspectors cannot visit a home work place without prior agreement of the owner or a search warrant. Arbitrary access to the homes of these workers is not desirable because of the prospect of intimidation. Yet the health hazards faced by these workers must be seriously addressed, and a full disclosure of who is responsible and of the measures to eliminate unhealthy conditions must take place before the legislation is changed.

Furthermore, the increasing trend towards home work, including relocation of clerical jobs, such as putting data on video display terminals in the home, makes the possibility of an "electronic cottage industry" a reality. In her brief, Ms. Johnson stressed that the time had come creatively to address health and safety conditions in the home work place.

Selective exclusions from provisions of the act: Many other workers are excluded from particular rights under the act. Firefighters, police and workers in correctional facilities, training schools and observation homes are not entitled to refuse unsafe work under any circumstances. Workers in hospitals, nursing homes, psychiatric or other mental health or rehabilitation facilities, ambulance drivers, laboratory

workers, laundry workers, food service workers, all have the right to refuse unsafe work only in cases where the refusal does not jeopardize the life, health or safety of another person.

The problem with this category is that it has been broadly interpreted to mean the workers have the right to refuse in virtually no circumstance. An example of this was a work refusal by Mary Lou Ruttan, of OPSEU Local 226, a residential counsellor at Midwestern Regional Centre, a retardation facility operated by the Ontario government.

Ms. Ruttan was seven months pregnant when a patient in the residence in which she worked was identified as a hepatitis B carrier. She was concerned about putting herself and her unborn child in danger of contracting hepatitis. When she exercised her right to refuse, a Ministry of Labour inspector informed her she did not have the right to refuse unsafe work. However, both management and the union agreed that by refusing to work she was not placing any patient in imminent jeopardy.

On a verbal appeal by the union to the London regional office of the Ministry of Labour, Ms. Ruttan was told that she could not refuse work because there were no health care regulations under the act. Twenty days later, Dr. James of the occupational health branch issued yet a third and different interpretation of her right to refuse. He wrote that her unborn child was at high risk of contracting hepatitis but that she was not. Therefore, since foetuses were not explicitly covered under the act, her work refusal was not upheld.

Questions in the Legislature led to a new interpretation by the ministry which clearly indicated that women had the right to protect unborn children.

Firefighters' right to refuse; they were excellent in their presentation: Not having the right to refuse has placed groups like firefighters in an untenable situation. According to Frank Durocher, of Local 455 of the International Association of Fire Fighters, when a fire breaks out in a plant where a number of different chemicals are stored, firefighters may have no knowledge of the kinds of substances or quantities to which they must expose themselves. This also applies when firefighters clean up chemical spills. In addition, many chemicals interact or react to heat, producing new hazards.

It is the responsibility of the senior officer on the scene to evaluate the situation and to decide whether to risk the lives of the men fighting the fire. However, the officer must make this deci-

sion without knowing where the chemicals might be stored or what the dangers from the chemicals might be. Without the option of the right to refuse, workers are forced by law to take risks in many situations where risks cannot be properly evaluated.

If they are not allowed to refuse, firefighters feel there should be strict right-to-know legislation which would force companies to identify the chemicals they are using, where they are stored, the hazards associated with these chemicals and the proper medical treatment in the event of exposure.

We deal with yet another section to be included, because these are things we did not consider at the time: retail workers, the right to health and safety committees. Retail workers are also excluded from rights under section 8 of the Occupational Health and Safety Act on the assumption that places like supermarkets and other retail outlets are not hazardous work places. Retail employees, along with many other workers, have therefore been denied the right to join health and safety committees.

Diane Holland, of United Food and Commercial Workers Local 633, gave many startling examples of situations in supermarkets that were hazardous. For example, in the meat department, water on the floor often does not drain properly and employees operate bandsaws while standing in water. Employees are exposed to toxic fumes from the polyvinyl chloride film when it is cut to wrap meats and produce. Retail workers faced additional hazards of poor storing of merchandise and long hours on their feet. Cashiers experience cold and drafts from check-out counters which are close to doorways.

In a submission from Organized Working Women, a 1981 survey done by the Ontario Retail Council of United Food and Commercial Workers on the health effects of ring-and-bag systems was cited. Under the system, cashiers must lift products and pass them over a computer reader with one hand while ringing up with the other.

9:40 p.m.

More than 80 per cent of all surveyed cashiers reported experiencing negative health effects while more than 20 per cent had continuous or frequent pain in one or more parts of their bodies. A full 62 per cent reported back problems caused by repetitive forward stretching for articles and bending to bag them. In addition, the computer surveillance of ring-and-bag cashier work creates enormous stress to workers.

Because of their exclusion, retail workers also

have no right to regulate inspection, and inspectors visit as infrequently as once every three years.

We make the following recommendations with respect to exclusion:

60. Section 3 of the act must be removed. No worker shall be excluded from the Occupational Health and Safety Act.

61. All the rights and provisions granted to workers in these recommendations must apply to all workers.

There is another group that is even more vulnerable, if that is possible, and that is the unorganized workers. Susan Meurer, an unorganized VDT operator, came before our committee and she said: "There is always the problem that if you complain too much in the work place, the employer will say, 'If you find it unsafe, you should probably go and find some other kind of work.'" That is the solution, of course.

If there was one area of concern about which the task force could not get adequate information, it was in the area of unorganized work places. It is clear that workers in all sectors who do not have union representation have not been made fully aware of their rights under the act. As well, most of these workers would not come forward to the hearings for fear of reprisals by their employers.

Yet those who did come forward gave ample evidence to suggest that the act is not working for them and that the problems in the unorganized work place are even more severe than most of the cases documented in this report. Workers at Wilco in London, for example, have been exposed to excessive levels of lead and have suffered debilitating health effects. The case study of Wilco in this section graphically illustrates the problems faced by the unorganized workers.

Video display terminal operators, the majority of whom are unorganized and work in offices, have virtually no protection under the Occupational Health and Safety Act. One unorganized operator making a submission to the task force said the following:

"It is a controlled function, working on a VDT or computer. Your working situation is completely controlled. You do not have any control over your work process. It is a very stressful working situation. In most cases low-pay, unorganized female workers even now have few rights and very little protection. One of the concerns of people in my work place is where do we go, to whom do we go with our

concerns and our unorganized work place. The ministry would not come out to test our terminals even though at management's request." So much for the Ministry of Labour again.

When an unorganized VDT operator at Petrosar's corporate office exercised her right to refuse work on the VDT because she was pregnant, the ministry inspector did not uphold her refusal because "the VDT is not likely to endanger the worker or another person." The worker sought assistance from the organized workers in the plant and, with the help of the Energy and Chemical Workers Union, won her case. Most unorganized workers do not have access to unions to help back them in their efforts to protect their health.

Worker intimidation, failure to establish committees and the ministry's failure to enforce are experienced in work places across Ontario. The unorganized workers are particularly vulnerable. The effectiveness of the internal responsibility system in nonunion plants is completely unknown.

Bray W. D. Rivett Company Ltd., a plant in Gananoque, has been organized for only two years. Prior to the workers, becoming members of the United Electrical Workers, there had been no discussion on health and safety. In a submission to the task force in Ottawa, John Lameront of United Electrical Workers Local 522 said that in eight years there had been only one ministry inspection the workers knew about, and no health and safety committee was set up when the Occupational Health and Safety Act was proclaimed.

Contracting out is another means of transferring hazardous work conditions from a unionized shop to a nonunionized work place where workers are not always aware of the hazards. In a United Auto Workers' submission at the London hearings, workers at Northern Telecom Ltd. expressed these concerns. In June 1982 a beryllium-copper alloy was to be machined in the company's tool room. Two workers refused to work. The ministry upheld the refusal and issued extensive orders regarding beryllium alloy machining. The company, instead of making repairs, contracted out the work to unorganized work places and the ministry accepted this contracting out as compliance with the orders. Yet there was no follow-up by the ministry to ensure these unorganized workers were protected from exposure.

After the task force submission, questions were raised in the Legislature, and the ministry is now monitoring the contracting out in this

work place. However, the task force is not convinced that efforts are being made to correct the larger problem of the ministry accepting the practice of contracting out to unorganized work places as compliance with orders, with no follow-up to check those new work places working with toxic substances.

Voluntary health and safety committees in organized work places have little ability to encourage their employer to clean up the work site, but still have recourse to negotiations. Unorganized workers concerned with health and safety, however, have to rely entirely on the Ministry of Labour to support their positions. When a dispute arose between workers and management over whether fume hoods were necessary to ventilate a hospital where workers were inhaling potentially carcinogenic drugs, the ministry admitted fume hoods were necessary, but did not order the hospital to ventilate.

Without a union, there is no other body to negotiate health and safety matters for workers when the ministry fails to initiate cleanup orders. In addition, employees who have witnessed others losing their jobs over health and safety in these situations are afraid that by raising these issues they will lose their jobs.

Lest members think I am being overly heavy, let me quote from Bruce Doern from the Centre for Policy and Program Assessment at Carleton University. In his study done for the royal commission on asbestos, he concluded by saying the following:

"The job of the inspector in the small unorganized establishment is made particularly difficult by the tenuous position of the employee. It is almost trite to point out that the internal responsibility system cannot operate effectively where a worker thinks or fears that he jeopardizes his job every time he lodges a complaint." This is the real key line: "Prohibition of reprisals notwithstanding, an employer can almost always find some excuse to dismiss an 'obstreperous' employee."

Let us look at a case study at Wilco-Canada Inc., just briefly. The complete vulnerability of the unorganized worker was made clear at the task force hearings in London, when workers had the courage to tell their experiences at Wilco.

Wilco-Canada Inc. in London is a plant which manufactures tubular products for automotive and refrigeration industries, employing 190 workers in 1982. Early in 1982, workers found that 20 employees had lead poisoning within an eight-month period, and at least three of these had

become sexually impotent. The company had violated both the Occupational Health and Safety Act and the lead regulations. It failed to inform workers of the hazards of working with lead.

After some workers contracted lead poisoning the company provided inadequate respirators. It failed to post results of the air sampling and monitoring in the work place. There was no joint health and safety committee in place. There were inadequate facilities for washing up and eating, so contaminated clothing was being taken home. Also a lead assessment, as required by law, had not been undertaken, nor was a lead control program in place.

In December 1981, 16 employees who were off work from lead poisoning were sent letters saying that if they did not return to the plant to lower-risk work at lower pay, they would be ineligible for workers' compensation or unemployment insurance benefits and would be fired. I raised this matter in the Legislature, but after a flurry of meetings and orders, little seems to have changed.

9:50 p.m.

Several workers who had suffered serious health effects appeared before the task force. Brad Tunks was a tube mill assistant who was given no information on the hazards of lead when he started work in February 1981. By November of that year, he was experiencing irritability, stomach cramps, headaches and excessive sleepiness, all signs of lead contamination. Blood tests showed excessively high levels of lead and he was removed from his work. However, he too received a letter which threatened dismissal and he returned to work in January 1982. By March, the lead poisoning was so severe he required hospitalization and special drugs to clear the lead from his body.

With no union to represent him, Brad attempted to fight the company, but was passed between the Workers' Compensation Board, the Ontario Labour Relations board and the Ministry of Labour. At the end of July, the WCB cut off Mr. Tunks's benefits because his blood lead levels had dropped although some of the health effects were still present. Simultaneously, Wilco laid him off saying they had fulfilled their staffing requirements. To date, Mr. Tunks is still waiting for an appeal hearing for the WCB.

This is one story of many. Another person at the task force hearing told of four workers, aged 18 to 23, who were off work from lead poisoning. The WCB sent them back to work when

their lead levels dropped below 0.50 milligrams per litre, and the next day they were laid off.

Dan Wood, another Wilco worker, told the task force conditions in the plant had not improved since the ministry had issued orders. The lead control program had been designed by management without worker consultation and still no ventilation has been put in place to remove the lead. Mr. Wood relayed how workers were still getting sick from lead contamination.

Yet the ministry has not enforced the act or the lead regulations. It has failed to protect workers who are struggling to have a union, the United Auto Workers, but to date do not have that protection and representation. The Ministry of Labour told the New Democratic Party it would not prosecute the company for reprisals under section 24 of the act because the workers had not exercised their right to refuse under section 23.

Finally, in April 1983 the ministry laid charges against Wilco. It charged six workers for failing to wear respirators, and it charged two supervisors and the company for recent violations. One charge against Wilco was laid under subsection 24(1) for reprisal against a worker who exercised his right to refuse. The charges have not yet been heard. The ministry has never moved against the letters threatening dismissal, nor has it moved to correct the lead hazard in the plant which has been the cause of the health problems of Wilco workers.

Because of this, we have made a number of recommendations which, we hope, the government will introduce to protect the vulnerability of the unorganized.

62. The greatest health and safety protection for the unorganized will be achieved by amending the Ontario Labour Relations Act to facilitate organizing workers into the unions which can provide the most protection to their rights.

63. Special protections must be developed and incorporated into the act to protect the unorganized workers, including central reporting of committees to the Ministry of Labour and central reporting of inspections and follow-up to unorganized plants.

64. There shall be guaranteed funding to community occupational health and safety groups, such as the Windsor Occupational Safety and Health Council, in each major industrial centre to carry out vital education and advocacy work. This is particularly important for the unorganized workers.

I am winding down now, as the members can see. The pile is getting smaller.

Mr. Sargent: Let it go, Elie.

Mr. Martel: Thank you.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: There are only 35 minutes. Keep it going. Use all your time tonight.

Mr. Martel: If the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Ashe) is learning something it will help.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: It gets repetitive.

Mr. Martel: I have not repeated a thing.

Special sectors: There are many special sectors for which there are no specific regulations, yet for which a number of problems exist. Day care workers, social service workers and others who appeared before the task force explained the problems this creates.

In other cases, the act has explicitly excluded a sector. Elliot Lake miners, for example, who fought for health and safety protection in Ontario, still have not acquired the same rights for themselves. Last year there were 1,700 orders issued against the two companies in Elliot Lake. That was in one year. There is not a charge.

I want to deal with office workers. William Dickerson, Mid-Canada Council, Office and Professional Employees' International Union, said to the task force: "Due to recent innovations in office technology, office employees find themselves exposed to an environment drastically different from that of years past. The introduction of Xerox copy machines, video display terminals and teletype machines, for example, expose operators to new hazards affecting their physical wellbeing."

Many workers appearing before the task force were working in offices. Their complaints were universally similar; the hazards of office work are not taken seriously by management and the current legislation inadequately protects them. The fact that office workers are expressly excluded from having joint health and safety committees, under clause 8(b)(1) of the Occupational Health and Safety Act, confirms this.

More than 80 per cent of office workers are women, the majority of whom are unorganized workers in banks, insurance companies, law offices and other nonunionized work places. These workers need the protection of strong legislation. There are not even specific regulations prescribing safety standards for office work. Workers in offices are currently administered under the general provisions of the industrial regulations, which are totally inappropriate.

David Foley of CUPE Local 791 made a

submission on behalf of workers of the Corporation of the City of Kitchener. He, like many other workers, complained of the failure of the Ministry of Labour to inspect office work places. In the case of CUPE Local 791, the local inspector will inspect only the industrial area of the corporation, not the offices. Mr. Foley also expressed concern about the employer's attitude towards office hazards, which are not seen as important.

He stated: "When we discuss the problem of lack of blinds on windows, improperly designed chairs and desks, improper ventilation and overcrowding, not to mention obvious concerns such as electrical outlets which are mounted on the floor in travel areas, we are ignored regarding the obvious, told to get substantiated proof regarding the ergonomics and advised that because the budget had to be trimmed, other considerations were more essential. This comes from a supervisor whose well-furnished, air conditioned office is larger than the entire work area provided for a portion of his staff."

These hazards are in fact real, and the traditional assumption that the office work place is safe must be challenged. There are hazards from the physical environment of the office: improper lighting, excessive or repetitive noise from copiers and key punch operations, or overcrowding. The increased number of sealed or climate-controlled buildings has often meant employees work in environments improperly ventilated, with inadequate air changes and exposure to toxic substances or bacterial infection. Many products used in the office are hazardous. Toluene and other solvents from toners, erasers and cleaners pose hazards in both the short and long term. Ozone from copiers can result in dizziness or drowsiness; in the long term its effects are unknown.

Yet these concerns are often ignored, and even where unions fight for testing, it is often inappropriately done. Greg Randle of CUPE Local 87 produced documents at the Thunder Bay task force hearings showing that management had complied with requests to test for ozone, but it was done on a one-time basis on a day when the copier had been mostly idle. Mr. Randle argued that the failure of management to conduct a series of tests under realistic working conditions indicates a lack of respect for workers' concerns.

The massive influx of microchip technology into the office has had a major effect on workers. Many submissions to the task force raised concerns about the health effects of

video display terminals. The Occupational Health and Safety Act has no regulations governing work conditions on VDTs, and there are no laws in effect which require testing at the point of the machine's production. In addition to the suspected hazards from low level radiation, there are also concerns about exposure to PCBs, excessive heat and glare.

The strain of repetitive work with improper lighting and no required breaks heightens the hazards. Poor machine design, incorrect layout of equipment and overcrowding are further ergonomic hazards experienced by office workers. One of the newest problems intensifying office stress is the use of technology to monitor productivity of workers.

Workers are pitted against each other and themselves, with constant monitoring, accompanied often by reprimand and pressure tactics by management. Workers have no protection under the law against these practices.

10 p.m.

Susan Meurer, a video display terminal operator in Toronto, raised concerns that equipment capacity now dictates the work load: "In the two years I have been doing it"—that is, operating a VDT—"I would say my work has doubled, and this is because the equipment is constantly changing and able to handle a greater capacity, at a faster speed. Of course, we have to keep up with whatever the increased load is."

The stress created by increased work loads is but one of the health effects. VDT operators report skin rashes, strained eyes and muscle and back problems due to poorly designed equipment. Bob DeMatteo of the Ontario Public Service Employees Union spoke of a case the union is currently fighting for a clerical worker who has cataracts that some medical evidence suggests may have been caused by radiation.

Questions about reproductive hazards have not been seriously addressed by the government. Mr. DeMatteo in his submission to the task force raised the matter of the cluster of miscarriages in an office of old city hall in Toronto, where the miscarriage rate in 1981 was 62 per cent, a staggeringly high figure. Yet the doctor sent in by the ministry to investigate recorded only superficial information, never contacted the women involved and concluded that there was no significance to the cluster.

The occupational health branch did radiation tests and found that the VDTs were emitting fairly high levels of low-frequency radiation, yet the Ministry of Labour would not issue orders to shield the machines. To date there has been no

satisfactory study done of reproductive hazards here or in any other Ontario work place.

Workers must fight even to have health effects properly recorded. Workers from the Canadian Union of Public Employees Local 543, from the city of Windsor, submitted to the task force a copy of a questionnaire on VDTs circulated to VDT operators by their management. It was interested primarily in the workers' miscarriage history and in exposure to colour televisions and microwave ovens. There were no questions in the survey dealing with immediate health effects such as eye problems, physical effects or stress.

Microchip technology and the failure to protect is not confined just to the traditional office work environment. Joyce Rosenthal, in her submission on behalf of Organized Working Women, stressed the potential hazards to both children and teachers in the school system, where VDTs are being introduced. Children may be more susceptible to the possible radiation hazards of VDTs, and all workers and students using the machines should have guarantees of proper lighting, adjustable furniture and proper spacing, shielding and ventilation of machines.

In addition, office workers in nontraditional environments often face industrial hazards but have no rights to health and safety committees. Dawn Cartwright of de Havilland Aircraft of Canada Ltd., where the office workers are members of United Auto Workers Local 673, spoke of the frequency with which office workers are sent into the plant to communicate information.

Bill Dickerson, a member of the Office and Professional Employees' International Union, is an office worker at Domtar Forest Products in Red Rock, Ontario. He and other office workers face hazards of excessive dust because they work in portable offices on the industrial work site, yet they are classified as office workers and thereby excluded from section 8 of the act.

I want to deal briefly with the health care sector. I want to quote Bob DeMatteo, health and safety co-ordinator of OPSEU: "Three years ago health care regulations were promised to us in one month. Why should we go through the farce of participating in a consultative process if the ministry is not interested in giving us protection?"

Health care workers are currently administered under the general umbrella of industrial regulations by the Ministry of Labour, totally inappropriate protection for their health and

safety in the work place. The health care regulations were drafted three years ago and have yet to become law. This failure to regulate has become a convenient excuse for the ministry not to enforce protection under the act.

Workers at St. Lawrence Lodge in Brockville, members of CUPE Local 2107, were required to transport patients with psychiatric disorders, some of whom were violent, to hospitals in Kingston, a distance of 96 kilometres. The practice had always been to have two workers, one to drive and the other to care for the patient. When management directed that only one driver would make the trips, the employees protested to the Ministry of Labour under clause 14(2)(g) that the employer's duty is to take every precaution reasonable in the circumstances for the protection of workers.

At the same time there were an increasing number of complaints from workers about the violence of patients in nursing homes. In both cases the area manager for the Ministry of Labour ruled that since there were no regulations covering the health care sector, he was powerless to act upon the complaints of the threat to workers from violent or dangerous patients.

Patient violence was cited in a number of submissions to the task force as one of the principal hazards of working in chronic care facilities, hospitals and psychiatric institutions. Shirley Scarrow of Ontario Public Service Employees Union Local 111 from London Psychiatric Hospital cited a growing incidence of worker assault by patients, including 13 in her facility in the first eight months of 1982. At the time of the task force hearings, two staff members had been off work for six months after having been beaten by patients.

These examples point out the serious gap between staffing standards and what is necessary for the protection of workers. The Ministry of Health sets by regulation the requirement for staff-patient ratios and the required hours of nursing care. These are outdated and inadequate because of the changing nature of institutionalized patients. The government's policy of deinstitutionalization has meant a higher concentration of more disturbed patients in the psychiatric facilities and a patient population requiring much heavier care in chronic facilities. Inadequate staffing creates problems of stress and even the possibility of violence.

It has also meant a staggering increase in back injuries. In every single submission from health care workers, this was cited as a major occupa-

tional hazard. Inadequate staff to lift patients and inadequate numbers of mechanical lifts have contributed to this. I believe nurses and nurses' assistants have now equalled miners for back injuries in the province.

George Wilson, on behalf of Joan Duerden of CUPE Local 1263, appeared before the task force representing 600 workers in homes for the aged in the Niagara region. They blamed safety problems, resulting in things such as back injuries, on the restraint policies of the provincial government. I quote:

"Underfunding of these homes means understaffing, and understaffing means that a staff member is under considerable pressure to try and lift the resident alone rather than consume the time needed to find another overburdened staff member to help lift. This in turn is resulting in back injuries to staff and in some cases has resulted in injuries to residents as well."

Communicable diseases are regulated under the public health laws, but worker exposure is not specifically covered. For example, ambulance drivers of a CUPE local in Sudbury have complained that they do not know until after they have handled a patient whether the patient has a communicable disease.

The task force heard of instances where registered nursing aides at Perley Hospital in Ottawa, members of CUPE Local 870, were not informed about patients having communicable diseases, so they did not know whether they were being exposed to a patient with contagious health problems; yet they are routinely expected to assist patients with personal hygiene. The solution is clearly to set up a preventive information system where RNAs are warned about the exposure before working with a patient.

The issue of anaesthetic gases and other toxic fumes is an important concern of hospital workers both in respect to short-term hazards and long-term reproductive effects. Members of CUPE Local 424 from Stratford General Hospital spoke of their hospital management, which is quite co-operative on most issues but which has not yet resolved the continuing problem of alcohol fumes in the lab.

CUPE's national health and safety representative, Colin Lambert, learned that the Ministry of Labour, in co-operation with the Ontario Hospital Association, had conducted a 10-hospital study on workers exposed to ethylene oxide and had concluded there was not a problem of exposure. At no time during this study were the workers in these 10 hospitals consulted. Only

after considerable pressure did the Ministry of Health make available the names and study results of just six of these hospitals. Yet based on these results, a more extensive 75-hospital study on anaesthetic gases is under way, excluding ethylene oxide. To quote Colin Lambert at the St. Catharines hearings:

"So we are faced with a real game of catch-22. The Ontario Ministry of Labour tells us that all the hospitals in Ontario have no real problems with ethylene oxide, that they do not feel there is any need to change the present threshold limit value; nor do they feel that there is any need to monitor hospitals to determine whether there is overexposure to ethylene oxide for workers. They base this decision on a study of 10 hospitals, the results of which are confidential."

10:10 p.m.

Until hospital workers are given access to information on toxic substances unique to their work environment, and real access to management's and government's decisions about the hazards of such gases, they will not be protected. Many workers urged task force members to press for specific regulations to protect the health and safety of workers in the health care sector.

Coming from Sudbury as I do, I could not help but include a small section on mining. I am quoting from Dan Sweezy, the health and safety officer for the United Steelworkers of America, Local 6500.

"The one area in which the ministry has not improved, but failed drastically, is the enforcement area of the mine safety inspection branch. This branch has used the terminology 'internal responsibility system' as a definite crutch to shirk its responsibility."

Last year there were 12 mine fatalities and countless other accidents and injuries. Mining continues to be extremely hazardous work and those who appeared before the task force stressed a number of concerns which need to be immediately addressed. Despite all the technological advances, mines today still need better lighting and substantial reduction of noise and dust levels. Workers still have inadequate sanitary and cleanup facilities and need improved lunch areas. In addition to the toxicity of the mine materials, workers face hazards of abnormal air pressure and carbon dioxide from emissions from constantly running machinery.

Dr. Joseph Cummins, a geneticist with the University of Western Ontario in London, told the task force that recent changes in mining technology posed new hazards. His experiments

have shown that the oil-salt explosives being used leave mutagenic, carcinogenic residues in the air and on surfaces. Plastic polymers now being used to retain tunnel walls react with nitrogen oxides from diesel exhausts and nitrate-oil explosives to release highly carcinogenic nitrosamines. Cummins stressed that new protective devices are needed to rectify those problems. In the case of nitrosamines, for example, they readily penetrate rubber protective clothing.

Workers told the task force of unsafe conditions created by home-made parts of mining machinery. One steelworker in Thunder Bay spoke of modifications to equipment because the proper replacement parts were not available. Clause 14(1)(b) of the Occupational Health and Safety Act states, "The equipment, materials and protective devices provided by him"—that is, the employer—"are maintained in good condition." Yet this does not preclude home-made devices as stop-gap measures, which are often dangerous underground.

The same holds true in the work process. Steelworkers at the Thunder Bay hearings cited one example of a concentrate dryer where the igniting flame of an oil-fired system could not be started one night. The supervisor, concerned about production, told a worker to ignite the dryer with an oxygen acetylene torch. That worker refused, believing it to be hazardous, then another worker refused. Instead of following the work refusal procedure under section 23, the supervisor did the hazardous job himself. And he got his head blown off too.

Another problem is the high number of mining inspectors and engineers who bring a management bias to the job. Workers at the task force hearings urged that more inspectors be appointed from the ranks of workers. According to Dan Sweezey of USWA Local 6500, of the last few appointments to the mining branch of the Ministry of Labour, five of six hired were former Inco management.

Accessibility to ministry inspectors during weekends or graveyard shifts is also a problem. Local 6500 of the Steelworkers pointed out to the task force that 24-hour operations need 24-hour availability of inspectors in case of accidents. An incident after the hearings clearly confirmed their concerns.

On January 29, 1983, during the graveyard shift at the Copper Cliff nickel refinery in Sudbury, excessive amounts of nickel carbonyl were twice released, entering the plant and surrounding environment. The workers experi-

enced dizziness and had to be given oxygen. Of the 13 workers, nine had amounts of nickel carbonyl above permissible levels in their urine. The Ministry of Labour was called at 5:30 a.m. Not until two days later, on the Monday afternoon, did they come to investigate—two full days.

The threat of fires is another imminent hazard for underground workers. Workers told the task force that section 34 of the mining regulations requiring safe procedures for hot work, such as blowtorch or welding, are not followed by management and not enforced by the ministry. They urged that the requirements for firefighting equipment under this section of the regulations be strengthened to make it mandatory that firefighting equipment be attached to the welding gear.

Andy Delarosbil of USWA expressed concerns about the mining regulations allowing workers to work alone underground. He stated: "It is a common experience for a worker to be assigned to work alone." This is under section 15 of the mining regulations. "However, in underground mining this could be disastrous. The company's practice is to visit at least every two hours. What happens if the worker is drilling and loose rock falls on him? If his shift boss was in just 15 minutes ago, the result is he could be pinned under for a minimum of one hour and 45 minutes before someone comes. One hour and 45 minutes could be the difference between life and death." It is imperative that no one works alone underground.

The distance from medical help is also a problem. There are often accidents in mines, yet Shebandowan mine, for example, is almost 100 kilometres from the nearest medical attention. Mine workers urged the task force that a qualified industrial nurse be on all operating shifts and that management should pay for first aid training for workers. Both measures would help save lives.

Other concerns raised by workers include incomplete inspections of mining properties, the exorbitant costs of protective clothing and training requirements under the mining regulations being interpreted as maximum requirements instead of the minimum resulting in less than fully skilled new workers in the mines.

The construction sector: Every year a large number of construction workers fall victim to industrial accidents and disease. Although the act has contributed to improved working conditions on construction sites, incorporated into the act are limitations or lines of responsibility

that make health and safety problems on these sites difficult to resolve.

For example, a safety representative is only mandatory on a construction site where the number of employees is greater than 20. This is in subsection 7(1) of the act. Since many small construction projects employ far fewer than 20 people, often no one on a construction site is responsible for health and safety.

On larger construction projects where there are more than 20 workers, the worker who is selected as the health and safety representative may only be knowledgeable about the hazards of one craft. The construction unions told the task force that, as in collective bargaining, the selection of health and safety representatives on construction sites should allow for one representative from each craft working on the site.

The union representatives also pointed out that the act places greater responsibility on the employee to act as his own protector in identifying and pointing out hazards to the employer. Since construction work depends on moving from one job to the next, workers on construction sites are reluctant to point out hazards for fear of being discriminated against on a new site when their current job ends.

Another difficulty for construction workers is in section 13 of the act which places responsibility for health and safety matters at a construction site on the contractor, rather than the owner.

Where a work place is a project, the contractor must look after health and safety problems. However, construction workers have had difficulties in being exposed to hazards which were beyond the control of the contractor, such as where a construction job involves an addition or renovation to an industrial operation. Workers in Thunder Bay working on an addition to a pulp and paper mill found that stack gases from the mill were building up in an area where construction work was taking place. Because they were not part of the joint health and safety committee in the mill, they could only appeal to the contractor to solve their problems.

On certain construction projects the owner may hire two contractors for separate aspects of the job. Because the responsibility for health and safety does not rest with the owner, if one contractor is negligent, workers hired by the second contractor may be exposed to hazards over which they have no control.

For construction workers the key to a safe work place is vigorous enforcement by the Ministry of Labour. The union representing the

largest number of construction workers in the province—Labourers International—believes that while work sites in major cities such as Toronto may be inspected frequently, remote work sites, particularly in northern Ontario, suffer from understaffing and a subsequent lack of enforcement.

10:20 p.m.

However, even frequent inspections by the Ministry of Labour have not guaranteed construction workers freedom from hazards on the job. Rodmen, who as part of their work on construction sites are required to hang off belts on vertical walls, have suffered from acute back injuries, as well as developing serious degenerative back disease.

A 1977 survey by the Iron Workers Union Local 721 showed that 70 per cent of the rodmen responding to the survey suffered degenerative back effects, while 90 per cent of the rodmen and ironworkers quit their work because of back problems. Yet there is virtually no legislation that would address the health problems of rodmen arising from work practices such as climbing and hanging off vertical walls or bending over all day tying steel rods.

Although section 76 of the construction regulations has been interpreted as prohibiting the practice of hanging off belts as a substitute for scaffolding, the Ministry of Labour is not enforcing the legislative protection that exists. In addition, these back problems have not been recognized historically in claims to the Workers' Compensation Board.

I want to finish by saying that the most important thing we have is our health. Yet the conditions in which thousands of people work in our province place their health in jeopardy. Many of the causes of industrial diseases and accidents have been known for 40 or 50 years, according to Dr. James Nethercott, director of the occupational health clinic at St. Michael's Hospital in Toronto. Despite this knowledge, Ontario has not done nearly enough to eliminate the causes of these problems.

The key to our approach is to give workers the ability as well as the right to assure themselves of a healthy work place. We based our recommendations on the experience of working people, as we heard their concerns at hearings and through submissions. We did so not just on the dozens of specifics which flaw the Occupational Health and Safety Act, but also on the approach of this government to this vital human field.

What did we find and what did we hear?

Principally, it was dissatisfaction, frustration, fear, disappointment and a sense of futility.

There is dissatisfaction with the internal responsibility system. Management, and not the health and safety committees, decided in the final analysis what would be done to correct health and safety problems. Frequently, if more than token costs were involved, that proved to be very little. There is dissatisfaction with the lack of enforcement of this province's laws. Tens of thousands of orders are issued, and 10 to 15 per cent must be repeated because companies fail to comply. Yet charges are few, fines are low and workers continue to get hurt or become ill.

There is frustration with their difficulty in improving conditions despite much time and effort. Many workers spend hours of their free time trying to improve working conditions at their plants, factories or offices. But when they are continually thwarted at every move, exasperated union and health and safety committee members are tired of the fight because they are essentially powerless to bring about meaningful change.

There is fear, from their inability to obtain adequate information about substances they handled or inhaled in their work. Firemen did not know where the substances were located and what quantities were involved when fighting a fire. When working with drugs, workers often did not know the effects on them. Constant attempts to get information about chemicals and their hazardous effects proved futile for many, and when workers have tried to claim their rights to a healthy and safe work place, they have been threatened with letters of dismissal, have lost pay, have been sent home from work and have been subjected to other subtle forms of intimidation.

There is disappointment, because many workers felt that the Occupational Health and Safety Act would make a safe work place possible. Many told us they were no better off now than before the act was introduced. Many have never seen a copy of the act and are not trained to make the act work.

There is futility in that many felt a higher value was attached to their employer's costs than basic health and safety concerns. If costs are minimal, changes are possible. But all too often, health becomes secondary to the balance sheet.

For many, these concerns can be traced back to one key fact: too much power in health and safety matters continues to lie in the hands of those whose actions resulted in introduction of this legislation way back when. The clear consensus among those who presented evidence at our hearings was that only where management wanted a safe working place would it occur. But without enlightened companies and managers, the inherent flaws of the act and the failure of this government to enforce its own laws has meant there is no meaningful health and safety program in this province for hundreds of thousands of workers.

To those who still believe this act to be tough, strong or even slanted towards working people, let us examine the record. We have made every effort to report accurately and fairly what we have heard. We used a number of case studies to show where the act has failed and the way in which the ministry has failed to enforce the act.

Across the province, we found no abuse of the right of workers to refuse dangerous work, nor have workers been frivolous in their efforts to improve their working life. They are simply trying to protect their health, their lives and their families.

This report is a challenge to the Tory government. It is also a challenge to the people of Ontario. Those who say, "We cannot afford to do more," are really saying health is less important than private enrichment. The choice is clear.

Profit is paramount, it would appear, in our society. Yet if we lay aside the human calculus for a moment and simply examine the balance sheet, our failure to regulate health and safety and enforce even those inadequate laws on the books is costing society dearly.

In 1981, \$984 million was paid out in direct compensation to victims of occupational disease and accidents. In the same year, an estimated \$3.9 billion in indirect costs resulted from job-related diseases and injuries. When all the diseases proven to be work-related yet not accepted by the Workers' Compensation Board are added, billions of dollars more are hidden in our general health bill.

Too many workers are being used as guinea pigs while government and companies conduct epidemiological studies. We, in our party, have made our decision and our commitment. We do

not think health is a commodity to be bought and sold. We cannot afford to wait.

The work of changing the law has to be matched by a change in attitude as well. Nothing is more precious than life itself.

Mr. Cousens: Mr. Speaker, since I am usually sitting where you are at this time and the member for Sudbury East (Mr. Martel) has gone

on for such an extraordinary length of time, I will move adjournment of the debate and then have a fresh chance to get going when the next day comes.

On motion by Mr. Cousens, the debate was adjourned.

The House adjourned at 10:28 p.m.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, April 26, 1983

Throne speech debate

Mr. Martel 213

Other business

Adjournment 241

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Ashe, Hon. G. L., Minister of Revenue (Durham West PC)

Boudria, D. (Prescott-Russell L)

Cousens, D., Deputy Chairman and Acting Speaker (York Centre PC)

Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)

Sargent, E. C. (Grey-Bruce L)



Hansard

Official Report of Debates

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Third Session, 32nd Parliament

Thursday, April 28, 1983

Afternoon Sitting

Speaker: Honourable John M. Turner

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

Contents of the proceedings reported in this issue of Hansard appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of the speakers taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is \$15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, Information Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 965-2238.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Thursday, April 28, 1983

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

YOUNG ONTARIANS

Mr. Van Horne: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege: I think it is most important that the members of this chamber recognize the deeds of young Ontarians, particularly when those deeds are slightly different from the norm and when those deeds will bring benefits to the people of this province.

I am referring to the pending marriage of Mr. Gary McGuffen of London, Ontario, to Joan Wood, a young lady from Bracebridge. That of itself is noteworthy; I am sure all of us would wish them every success.

But beyond that, these two young people are taking a two-year honeymoon, travelling the route of our early explorers here in Canada from the Gulf of St. Lawrence up to the Arctic Ocean. During that time they will be noting their adventures and recording them for our students here in Ontario and for the Ministry of Education through a slide presentation they will be making along the way. I want to bring this to the attention of the chamber and I am sure the members present will wish, as I do, every success to these two wonderful young Ontarians.

DEATH OF HARRY BRAY

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the House would want me, on its behalf, to pay tribute to a former vice-chairman of the Ontario Securities Commission, Harry Bray, who has served this province well and who passed away yesterday. Harry Bray's contribution is recognized by many. His role in terms of the financial industry of this province and the preservation of its integrity and of the public interest is well understood. Indeed, many would look on him as the Elliot Ness of this province. It is with great sadness that I express regret at his passing.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I would like to join, as I know my colleagues would who knew Harry Bray, in expressing our immense regret at the suddenness of his death. Over the years, I had occasion to have been associated with Mr. Bray. I did not always agree with him but he

brought an unfailing courtesy to the work of the commission. He had served this province on the commission for something over 30 years. He was Mr. Securities as far as Ontario was concerned. The knowledge, skill and ability which is reflected in the Securities Act is a monument to his passing.

The remarks which he made at the end of December, when he attended the last meeting of the Ontario Securities Commission in his capacity as vice-chairman, are ones which should on an appropriate occasion be noted. He contributed to the integrity of the securities markets in this province in a way that this province must be indebted to him for his contribution. On behalf of my colleagues and others in the assembly who knew him, I would like to extend our condolences to his widow and to his children.

Hon. Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, I would rise to add a personal contribution on the passing of a most distinguished constituent of my riding, as well as a most distinguished public servant of this province, with whom I had the honour to serve both as a parliamentary assistant in the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations while many of the present statutes were being drafted and again as the minister when that particular legislation and many of the administrative practices were finalized.

Mr. Bray exemplified all that has made the public service of Ontario the finest in the world. He had an enormous zest for work, in a field that is infinitely complex, infinitely challenging and where the calibre of the man and his character are virtually always under test. It is true that from time to time there were allegations that Mr. Bray was too firm, too dedicated, but if Mr. Bray had any failing it was that he was too honest, and I do not think that is a failing.

At the same time, he was a very practical, realistic and very progressive public servant. As the former minister and as his member of the Legislature for many years, I would extend to his widow not only the usual condolences but also the fact that this assembly does recognize the tremendous contribution he made to the people, the investors and the business of this province.

2:10 p.m.

FLOOD PLAIN MAPPING

Mr. Swart: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege: In answer to questions put by the member for Essex North (Mr. Ruston) and myself on Tuesday, the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Pope) said, "The honourable member knows that the flood plain policy is one of the policies that will be applied under the Planning Act. He is aware that as a provincial policy that will take effect under the Planning Act."

I just want to say that in that statement the minister has misled the House, perhaps inadvertently from lack of knowledge. The facts are the flood plain mapping is applied independently of the Planning Act unless a council takes initiative on its own—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

OUTLOOK AGRICULTURAL
CONFERENCE

Mr. Riddell: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: I am sure you will agree that as elected members to this assembly we all share the responsibility of how the taxpayers' money is spent. I learned that the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Timbrell) held an outlook agricultural conference on Monday at taxpayers' expense. He did not extend an invitation to the agricultural critics of the opposition parties.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Riddell: He is obligated to do so and I think he is a small, narrow-minded man for not doing that. He aspires to become leader of this province and he ignores the important opposition.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Surely with the number of times we have spoken about identifying points of order and points of privilege, you must understand there is nothing out of order.

DIGITAL CLOCK IN CHAMBER

Mr. Speaker: Now that we are quite through with this informal period of whatever—

Mr. Sargent: Do it over again.

Mr. Speaker: No, please don't. I would like to point out, as I am sure all members have noticed, that the new timing device is now in place. I am not going to attempt to outline all its functions, but I am sure we are going to find it very useful and I am sure it will become familiar to all members as time goes on.

For today, I just want to point out that when question period starts, 60 minutes will show on the two display panels and will count down to zero, when they will flash for several seconds

before returning to the time.

In the throne speech debate, when a member starts to speak the panels will indicate how much time the party has had in the debate following the leadoff speakers and will count upwards, adding the time as he or she speaks.

I am sure you all understand that and I am sure we are going to have complete co-operation.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: Is it planned to ring a bell after a minute of the Premier's responses or nonresponses to questions?

Mr. Speaker: I think you should ask that during the proper time in oral questions.

Mr. Cunningham: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege: Dealing with the comments you have just made with regard to the timing device, I wonder, as you contemplate the use of the new timing device, if in the spirit of equity and fair play you would consider permitting a question to be answered after it is put, even as we approach the 60-minute mark.

It would sometimes appear we are endeavouring to run this place like the German railway in terms of time. In fairness to all members who would like to ask questions and obtain answers we might have those questions entertained even as we hit the conclusion of the 60-minute mark.

Mr. Speaker: I think I have attempted to use some discretion in that regard.

PREMIER'S HOROSCOPE

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege: I refer you to the Globe and Mail of today, Thursday, April 28, 1983. You will be aware that the Premier's (Mr. Davis) birthday is July 30 of this year—and every year as far as that goes. I refer you to this because for Leo, July 23 to August 22—and I want you to listen to this, Mr. Speaker—it states: "The field is clear for you to gain a leadership post. Keep your emotions under control. The less you say now the better. A romantic"—

Mr. Nixon: Now listen. Here's the big thing.

Mr. Peterson: "A romantic entanglement is sapping your energy."

Mr. Speaker: That is very interesting indeed, and I am sure the Premier will pay heed.

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY

DEATHS AT HOSPITAL
FOR SICK CHILDREN

Hon. G. W. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, I would like

to bring to the honourable members an update on the investigation into the tragic death of a six-and-a-half-month-old baby who died Saturday in the cardiac ward at the Hospital for Sick Children.

The infant, Gary Murphy of Kitchener, who had a severe congenital deformity of the heart, had been in hospital for more than three weeks. At about 6:20 p.m. last Saturday the baby went into cardiac arrest and efforts by the medical staff to revive him failed. Gary was pronounced dead at 6:37 p.m.

The first blood sample was taken from the heart three minutes after the baby was declared dead and a preliminary test indicated elevated levels of digoxin. A second test done three hours later substantiated the first. Dr. Murray Naiberg, the investigating coroner, informed the parents that elevated levels of digoxin had been found in the baby's blood and that an autopsy would be performed. An autopsy was performed at the hospital at 3 a.m. Sunday by Dr. Charles Smith. All of the levels obtained in the post mortem were above the normal level.

At 5 a.m., after consultation with Chief Coroner Dr. Ross Bennett, it was decided to call in the Metropolitan Toronto police to assist in the investigation. On Sunday morning Dr. Naiberg and doctors from the hospital met with the family and explained that further testing confirmed the high levels of digoxin and that further investigation was under way.

A team of scientists at the Centre of Forensic Sciences is still conducting tests at this time. Some 50 items, including tissues and materials from the room in which the child died, must be tested. Members can appreciate that this is meticulous and time-consuming work. To date, 15 tests have been completed. I am advised by the forensic staff that tests will not be completed until the end of next week.

My office has been in contact with Chief Jack Ackroyd and he has said that, contrary to reports, he cannot indicate that this death is a homicide. It continues to be investigated to determine the cause of death.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I too would like to share with the House as much information as I can about the death of Gary Murphy in the cardiac ward of the Hospital for Sick Children.

First, however, I wish to remind all honourable members that we have three considerations at this time. The first, clearly, is to find out why the Murphy child died, the second is to see

whether anyone deliberately or inadvertently contributed to that death and the third is to scrutinize the procedures in the hospital to ensure that they meet all reasonable standards for the care and safety of patients.

The first two issues are, as my colleague has stated, within the purview of the criminal justice system and are being vigorously pursued by the coroner, the police and the forensic scientists.

The third matter is the responsibility of the Ministry of Health and the subject of this report to the House. In presenting it I must ask all members of the House, the media and the public to avoid leaping to conclusions based on evidence so far available to reflect unfairly on anyone at the hospital or undermine public confidence in the Hospital for Sick Children. That would only compound the tragedy.

I say this recognizing the terrible impact of these events on the parents and families, on physicians, nurses and staff of the hospital and on the community, which certainly cannot be allowed to lose faith in the Hospital for Sick Children. As the committee under Mr. Justice Dubin observed, "It is truly one of our indispensable institutions;" and that, "It is still deserving of the complete confidence of the public."

2:20 p.m.

In considering what has just taken place, I ask members also to reflect on the observations of what has come to be called the Atlanta study, which was carried out by the staff from the Centers for Disease Control in the United States and by members of my ministry staff. In the recommendations I tabled in the House on February 21, they observed:

"For the future, it is important to recognize that no hospital is immune to the possibility of intentional harm to patients by hospital employees or others in the hospital. Situations of the sort have occurred before and may well occur again. Although absolute prevention of all possibilities for such actions would not permit hospitals to function, steps can be taken to discourage their occurrence. In the light of the current Toronto hospital experience we"—that is, the CDC—"would make two general recommendations, one concerning management of medications in the hospital, the other concerning the use of ongoing surveillance mechanisms to give an early warning if an abnormal mortality pattern is developing."

The safeguards they recommended varied only slightly in process from those recommended by Mr. Justice Dubin and his colleagues, and

they were in place in the hospital when this most unfortunate death occurred.

As a result of procedures and controls introduced in the cardiac wards following the discovery of the epidemic in March 1981, mandatory tests of digoxin levels were begun immediately following the death of the Murphy baby last Saturday night. The first results showed elevated levels of digoxin and these, as my colleague has indicated, were immediately reported to the coroner, who triggered the police investigation that has been referred to.

Since then my staff and I have met the senior trustees and officers of the hospital and we have reviewed all of the circumstances known to them and the procedures in the cardiac ward that might have a bearing on this tragedy.

Members are aware that the hospital board, management and staff welcomed the recommendations of the Dubin and Atlanta inquiries and have been moving towards their full implementation with great dispatch, particularly with those that affect patient care and safety.

On the basis of the information available to us at this time we are satisfied that the hospital has been faithful to its commitment to comply with the Dubin and Atlanta recommendations and that the procedures of the hospital do not appear at fault. As members know, the hospital has provided me with periodic detailed reports on the implementation of each of the review committee recommendations and it is doing a conscientious job.

Despite this, we must recognize realistically that the death that is now under investigation is bound to create apprehension and adds what I fear are increasingly intolerable burdens on the staff and administration of the hospital. As Mr. Justice Dubin noted:

"Those providing professional services at the hospital have found it difficult to practise their profession under such circumstances and the morale is strained. It is to their credit that their professionalism and skill and their work does not appear to have suffered to date even under such stress. Their ability to do so in the future will, we think, depend very much on the degree of support that the hospital receives from the public."

From my meetings these past two days I am certainly very aware of the toll these events are taking on the administration of the hospital. These are fine and dedicated people who are doing everything possible to ensure the necessary standard of excellence that is so much a part of this hospital.

From the time they originally became aware of this problem in the cardiac wards they adopted a whole range of new procedures to reinforce patient care and safety. They have welcomed outside advice from all quarters and they believe they have taken every reasonable step to protect their patients.

Let me give some illustrations. A unit dose system for digoxin has been instituted in the cardiac wards. The nursing staff there has been reorganized and expanded with the appointment of a new head nurse and two highly trained clinical instructors. They have spent \$100,000 on new patient monitoring equipment for a new intermediate care unit in the cardiac ward. The medical staff has been reinforced with two staff cardiologists, assigned as ward chiefs, instead of one. A second senior fellow has been assigned to the unit. Residents with more experience are now being used there and staff cardiologists are carrying out evening rounds in addition to the regular daily rounds of the past.

In these circumstances, which have been in place for some time now, this most recent death has been devastating for them and they have asked me to see whether there is anyone who can suggest what other steps they might or could take. We are now in the process of appointing one or more persons with a high level of hospital and medical experience to bring a new, detached perspective to the procedures and operations in place or planned at the Hospital for Sick Children.

At the request of the hospital, we will mandate that person or persons to review the current procedures in the hospital and to review the implementation of changes needed to reinforce once again the capacity for patient care and safety by working with the board, administration and staff. In the meantime, the hospital has implemented a number of very specific physical and medical security procedures in the cardiac wards and these will continue in place.

I am sorry I cannot share the terms of reference and timetable with the House because these will depend to some extent on who we are able to appoint. In spite of what has happened and the events in the cardiac ward, it is important to keep sight of the fact that hundreds of children continue to be treated and restored to health every day in the Hospital for Sick Children. It is, to repeat Mr. Justice Dubin, an indispensable part of our health care system and deserves public confidence.

I have confidence in that hospital. I am sure most honourable members share that confi-

dence and I know it is shared by the hundreds of families who daily place their trust in the skill, dedication and care which have always been the cornerstones of the Hospital for Sick Children.

VISITORS

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, prior to my statement but clearly related to it, I would like to introduce to you and ask members to join me in welcoming to Ontario three distinguished guests who are seated in your gallery this afternoon: the Honourable Henry Williams, Commissioner of Environmental Conservation for the state of New York; Mr. Anthony Taverni, acid rain co-ordinator for the state of New York, and Mr. John Spagnoli, regional director of the Department of Environmental Conservation in the state of New York.

Mr. Kerrio: Are they going to help the minister clean up his act?

Hon. Mr. Norton: They are very co-operative people.

ACID RAIN

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, later today the Minister of Environmental—Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Wells)—

An hon. member: Only on Malvern.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Since he has done such a fine job on Malvern, I thought I would give him credit. I am sure he would be quite willing to leave that responsibility with me.

The Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and I will be meeting with Mr. Henry Williams, Commissioner of Environmental Conservation for New York state. Our purpose in meeting is to sign a memorandum of understanding between the province of Ontario and the state of New York on a co-operative program to combat the present and future effects of transboundary air pollution and, in particular, acid rain.

2:30 p.m.

Both Ontario and New York state have common interests in the battle against acid precipitation. Many of their recreational lakes, like ours, have been seriously affected by the long-range transport of atmospheric pollutants. Our mutual concern is to apply the best possible science to study this very serious global phenomenon and to ensure that effective action is taken to eliminate its effects on our waters.

The memorandum will lead to standardization of methods and procedures used in sampling and laboratory analysis, the free exchange of scientific information and the opportunity for

joint scientific research. Also, it will eliminate duplication of cost and effort for both jurisdictions and increase our mutual effectiveness.

Perhaps of equal importance is the fact that one of the most powerful and influential states in the union recognizes with us the seriousness of acid precipitation and is willing to co-operate with a foreign jurisdiction on this problem. Ontario has gained an important ally, in my opinion, in its struggle against acid rain.

I am confident that the memorandum will be noted and carefully considered by the US federal authorities in Washington and by various other American states which so far have shown less concern and sympathy for the need to reduce emissions that cause this problem. It will contribute to the increase and awareness of acid precipitation as a serious pollution problem throughout the United States and Canada and thereby lend more weight, I believe, to our argument for increased control of emissions by federal US authorities.

I have met and talked with a number of state legislators and officials throughout the United States, and it is my hope that this Ontario-New York agreement will be one of a series of others to follow.

Mr. Bradley: Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the statement is missing a page. Did I miss the page where the minister invited the two opposition critics to be present at this meeting?

Hon. Mr. Norton: No, Mr. Speaker. I invite the honourable member to be present, if he so wishes, for the signing of the agreement, which will be occurring at the conclusion of question period.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It's good news. You don't want to be there, Jim.

Mr. Kerrio: You've got them this far. We are willing to help you, you know.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Kerrio: It is in order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: No.

DEVELOPMENTALLY HANDICAPPED PEOPLE

Hon. Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the House of the progress by my ministry on the five-year plan for the expansion of community services and the consolidation of facilities for developmentally handicapped people in this province.

As I stated on October 28, when I announced the details of the plan, the first phase involves the closing of the St. Lawrence Regional Centre

in Brockville. I am delighted to report that this phase is almost complete and we are extremely pleased with what has been accomplished to date.

When the institution closes, 74 of the 100 residents will be living in group homes and family homes in the community, and another six residents will be ready to move back to the community within two to three years, after they receive the additional training they require.

This means our earlier prediction regarding the number of residents who would be capable of community living was overcautious. The great majority will now enjoy a fuller life outside an institution. This shows what can be achieved when carefully planned community alternatives are provided.

I might add that the average age of these residents is 36. There are no children at this institution and, if our program of providing these community alternatives were not in effect, they would probably have spent the remainder of their lives in institutions.

The success of the first phase of the implementation of our five-year plan, combined with the successes my ministry achieved during the first seven years of its program of providing community alternatives to institutional living for developmentally handicapped people, reaffirms the wisdom and humanity of this policy direction.

As the Premier (Mr. Davis) indicated last week, there will be no moratorium on the five-year plan. To delay the plan would be to deny residents their right to live with dignity and a sense of self-worth in a setting that is most appropriate to their needs and abilities. It would simply deny them the opportunity for a fuller and more satisfying life.

I should point out that the Premier is one of the pioneers of community-based living for developmentally handicapped people. In addition to his personal conviction that at all times they should be afforded the greatest possible degree of participation in life, it was his commitment on May 16, 1974, to the annual conference of the Ontario Association for the Mentally Retarded in Peterborough that provided the long-term policy direction and financial resources for our program of community-based services.

It is because of the excellent co-operation my ministry has received from parents, from the local association for the mentally retarded and from the dedicated and committed staff at St. Lawrence Regional Centre that the first phase

of our five-year plan has progressed so well in such a short period of time.

I would also like to acknowledge the invaluable contribution of the member for Leeds (Mr. Runciman) towards the successful implementation of this first phase. He has been of great assistance to me, my staff, the residents, their parents and the community at large.

Individual plans have been formulated for all 100 residents at the St. Lawrence Regional Centre. Already, 55 residents have been placed in new settings as follows:

Eleven are now living in existing community residences in Cornwall, Bancroft, Kemptville, Seeley's Bay, Alexandria and Rockland.

Nine are in new community group homes in Mallorytown and Oxford Mills.

Nine are living with families in family home programs in Prescott, Perth, Portland and Vankleek Hill.

Twelve are at Rideau Regional Centre because of the francophone program there and their medical needs.

Three have been relocated in their home communities, at Oaklands in Oakville, Prince Edward Heights in Picton and Muskoka Centre in Gravenhurst.

Six are at the Adult Occupation Centre in Edgar, where they will receive the additional training they need for community placement.

One is at the Ongwanada facility in Kingston.

One, who requires a specialized program, is at Southwestern Regional Centre in Cedar Springs.

Three who require short-term psychiatric care are at Brockville Psychiatric Hospital.

Forty-one residents have been assigned places and will move over the course of the next several weeks.

Thirty-one residents will be accommodated in community group homes operated by the Brockville, North Grenville, Lanark, Almonte, Kingston and Dundas associations for the mentally retarded. My ministry is working closely with these associations to carry out these placements.

Eight will be in new community group homes developed by my ministry in Oxford Mills and Mallorytown.

Two will go to family home settings in Perth and Prescott.

Places are now being developed for the last four residents in the Brockville area.

I am also pleased to report that of the 77 civil servants at the St. Lawrence Regional Centre, 50, who were individually interviewed, have accepted new positions with my ministry. Another

seven are negotiating for positions with the Ministry of Health at Brockville Psychiatric Hospital.

Forty-one of the staff who have accepted new jobs with my ministry are going to the Rideau Regional Centre in Smiths Falls, five are going to Prince Edward Heights in Picton, three to other facilities and one to the ministry's regional office.

Most of the remaining 20 civil servants are waiting for openings in community services units or in other community operations being developed in the Brockville area.

In keeping with my commitment that no resident will move from any institution until a properly supervised residential setting is ready, I have instructed that the necessary complement of staff remain at the St. Lawrence centre until June 30, when the carefully planned relocation of every resident will be complete.

As I announced in October, rather than operating all 17 institutions at 62 per cent capacity, my ministry is consolidating its facility services. Bluewater Centre in Goderich is the second phase of this program.

I told the parents of residents at the Bluewater Centre that we would not proceed to the second phase of our program until I was satisfied with the progress in Brockville. In the light of our success there, we will be developing closure plans for Bluewater in the very near future.

Between now and the spring of 1986, my ministry will also be closing the St. Thomas Adult Rehabilitation and Training Centre, Pine Ridge in Aurora, D'Arcy Place in Cobourg and Durham Centre in Whitby. The number of residents at Oxford Regional Centre in Woodstock will be reduced from 657 to 484.

The closures will be implemented over a five-year period to ensure a gradual and orderly progression of residents to the community. This will also allow more than ample time for ministry staff to consult fully with parents and guardians of each resident to be moved, with the staff at the institutions to be closed and with the local associations for the mentally retarded which are working with us to carry out this plan. This time frame will ensure that no decision is made in haste or on an ad hoc basis.

2:40 p.m.

As I have already stressed, no resident of any institution for the developmentally handicapped will move to the community without a properly supervised residential setting and, where applicable, a work, training or activity program. Furthermore, the parents of every resident will

be individually consulted before any decision regarding relocation or community placement is made. As I have also emphasized, every civil servant in the six institutions to be closed will be given preference for jobs in the remaining facilities or in other areas within the public service where they may qualify. Some may elect, however, to obtain employment on their own in new community-based alternatives.

The Ministry of Community and Social Services has been providing community alternatives to institutional living for developmentally handicapped people since 1975. During the first seven years of the program, the ministry increased its budget for community services for developmentally handicapped people from \$10 million in 1975 to \$118 million in 1982. Between 1975 and 1982 the ministry also created 2,800 new community living places for developmentally handicapped children and adults and more than doubled the capacity of the workshop and employment training system to 7,600 places from 3,600 places. The development of these and other resources allowed some 3,800 residents of institutions for the developmentally handicapped in Ontario to move back to the community, and it reduced the overall population of these institutions by 1,400.

The number of residents at Rideau Regional Centre in Smiths Falls was reduced to 1,000 from 1,500, the population of Huronia Regional Centre in Orillia was cut to 967 from 1,500 and the population of Southwestern Regional Centre in Cedar Springs was pared to 654 from 894.

The success the ministry had between 1975 and 1982 with its program of promoting community living for developmentally handicapped people led us to plan an expansion of these services over the next five years. As members will recall, the five-year plan calls for the establishment of a network of new community-based services to be used by hundreds of developmentally handicapped people already living in the community and about 1,000 residents of the ministry's 17 institutions who will be moving to the community during the next five years.

The specifics of this plan are worth repeating in view of the questions raised in the past six months in this House and by members of the public. As I announced in October, we are now creating 750 new supervised community living places, 1,000 new spaces in the family support program, 244 new group home places, 1,381 new training and employment places for higher-functioning adults, 500 new training and employ-

ment places for lower-functioning adults, 200 new beds for severely handicapped children and 250 new places for severely handicapped adults.

The transfer of residents from our 17 institutions for the developmentally handicapped back to the community will reduce the number of beds needed in these institutions by another 989. Of the \$33.7 million in 1982 dollars that my ministry will spend to expand community services for the developmentally handicapped during the next five years, \$23.7 million will come from the closing of these institutions.

During the past six months, my ministry has written to every employee in the six institutions to be closed, to the parents or guardians of all residents and to the local associations for the mentally retarded, outlining the major elements of the five-year plan. Senior staff of my ministry have also attended numerous meetings and met privately on many occasions with parents, staff, union representatives, municipal officials and members of the Canadian Association for the Mentally Retarded, the Ontario Association for the Mentally Retarded and their local affiliates to discuss details of the plan. This communication will continue throughout the implementation of the closures.

I might add here that both the Canadian and the Ontario associations for the mentally retarded have endorsed my ministry's plan to expand community-based services for the developmentally handicapped. Many local associations for the mentally retarded have also expressed support for the plan and have offered to work with us to develop these local services.

As a result of these meetings and individual consultations, which will continue as specific plans for each institution and each resident are made, many parents who initially expressed concern about the five-year plan now actively support it.

I reiterate that we are delighted with the progress to date in the implementation of our five-year plan for expanding community living opportunities for the developmentally handicapped residents of this province. We are convinced that as support for this policy direction continues to grow within the community at large and among those directly affected by it, we not only will have many more success stories to relate but also will have provided a richer life for hundreds of developmentally handicapped people.

NORCEN ENERGY RESOURCES LTD.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, I have received

a letter from the chairman of the Ontario Securities Commission, dated April 26, 1983, which I would like to table in the Legislature.

This letter concerns the OSC's handling of the Norcen Energy Resources Ltd. investigation and was prepared by the chairman with the direct involvement of the seven other members of the commission who participated in the review of the commission staff report concerning the investigation. The letter addresses a number of issues.

However, at the outset I would like to make it clear that in making certain of the statements in the letter the commission is departing from its normal practice concerning confidential investigations. It is apparent from the letter that the commission feels that in this case the departure is required to correct some fundamental misunderstandings of commission procedures.

The commission advises that it will not release the staff investigation report, but the letter does contain a succinct statement of reasons for the commission's conclusions upon the review of that staff investigation. The commission has also hesitated to provide reasons for its conclusions, because it has been concerned about prejudicing the ongoing police investigation.

However, the commission has assumed that the Attorney General's opinion is that the police investigation will not be prejudiced by a statement on the basis of the Attorney General's comments to the effect that it would be in the public interest and in the interest of the commission for the commission to make a statement.

I would like to read excerpts from the commission's letter to me.

"Upon reviewing the evidence set out in the staff report, the commission inferred that senior officers of Norcen, on behalf of Norcen, pursued the establishment of a possible relationship with Hanna over an extended period of time from January 1979 to July 1982.

"In the course of this pursuit, the officers had under active consideration a number of fundamentally different alternative courses of action, including: (1) making limited open-market purchases to provide a basis for negotiation or to accumulate securities to be disposed of; (2) making a public tender offer to acquire 20 per cent of the outstanding Hanna shares; (3) making a public tender offer to purchase 51 per cent of the outstanding Hanna shares; and (4) negotiating an agreement with Hanna similar to the agreement announced July 7, 1982.

"In the commission's view, there was not a

'material change' in the affairs of Norcen or a 'material fact' in relation to securities of Norcen within the meaning of the Securities Act until the board of directors of Norcen or the senior officers, in the belief that their decision would be confirmed by the board of directors, decided to implement a specific course of action

"In reaching its conclusion, the commission was particularly mindful of one of the basic principles of the Securities Act, and that is to require disclosure of material changes upon their occurrence—no sooner, no later.

"The commission has administered its laws so as to counsel equally strongly against premature disclosure as against late disclosure. Late disclosure, of course, results in uninformed trading in the market. Premature disclosure can be equally destabilizing and can create confusion and result in expensive and disappointed investment expectations on the part of the investing public"

The commission, in that letter, also addresses the importance of the confidentiality of its investigations in the following words:

"Confidentiality is essential in order to facilitate the investigation and in order to avoid either prejudicing a person's rights to fair process in the event that findings of the investigation justify proceedings or damaging a person's reputation when the results of the investigation do not support further proceedings. The effective functioning of the commission depends heavily upon the reliance which parties affected by its operations can place upon the confidentiality of the commission's administrative proceedings."

2:50 p.m.

On the issue of why I, as Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations, must consent to a prosecution under the Securities Act, the commission states:

"We are strongly of the view that the confidence that the financial community has in the commission would be eroded in a fundamental way if one of the basic tools for administering the act, the decision to initiate prosecutions under the act, was removed from the commission or shared with another agency."

The House may recall the report of the Attorney General's committee on securities legislation in Ontario, more commonly known as the Kimber report, after its chairman, which noted the shift in securities regulation from the time it was first introduced and was primarily directed to the prevention of fraud in the sale of securities to the position today where securities

legislation is directed both at criminal and quasi-criminal law enforcement and at the enhancement of the position of the securities industry and the economic life of the province. An extract from the Kimber report is quoted in the letter.

Finally, the letter addresses the issue of the chairman's participation in the commission's review of the report of its investigators and spells out in some detail the steps he took to carry out what he believed to be the responsible course of action, which was to discharge his responsibilities as chairman if legally and practically possible.

In this connection, the letter has attached to it a letter from the seven commissioners, other than the chairman, who participated in the review of the investigation report, stating that they urged the chairman to participate in the matter because of the importance of the issues raised and emphasizing the exemplary manner in which the chairman conducted the discussion.

There are four schedules to the letter. The first schedule is a letter from the chairman, dated April 12, 1983, describing the commission's response to the Attorney General's request of me to have the commission reconsider its conclusion on the matter. The second schedule is a letter, dated April 14, 1983, from the chairman to me, concerning possible perceptions of a conflict of interest. The third schedule is a letter, also dated April 14, 1983, from the seven other commissioners which I described above. The fourth schedule is a legal opinion which the chairman obtained prior to involving himself in the matter.

I commend this material to those members of the Legislature who have been raising questions about the commission's handling of this matter and to other interested members of the Legislature. I point out, for the interested members, that the chairman, Mr. Peter Dey, is sitting in the Speaker's gallery today.

GOVERNMENT AND THE ARTS

Hon. Mr. McCaffrey: Mr. Speaker, today I want to inform members of the House of an important ministry initiative that may well have a significant impact on the form and direction of the relationship of the arts and government in the next decade.

Today I wish to announce the formation, under the authority of the ministry act, of a special committee to study the relationship of government and the arts in our province. The need for such a committee quite simply is that

culture and the arts in our province have enjoyed a period of unprecedented growth both in quantity and in quality over the past two decades. Much of this growth has been fuelled by the funding policies of this government and in particular of my ministry.

In 1963, the province undertook a review of the relationship between the arts and government. One of the recommendations of that review was the formation of the Ontario Arts Council. In 1963, the Ontario Arts Council had a budget of \$300,000, and the government's total funding of the arts was less than \$350,000 that year.

Ten years later, in 1973, a further review was carried out which resulted in the Guidelines for Cultural Policy Development being approved by cabinet. Government support for the arts had then grown to \$33 million per year.

In the fiscal year just ended, this government has allocated \$89 million to the arts through my ministry. Since the ministry was created in 1975, this government has allocated more than \$715 million to the cultural activities and facilities supported by this ministry. It would be difficult to point to another area of Ontario society that has enjoyed such explosive growth and so continuous a commitment of government support.

To maintain in the next decade the accelerating patterns of growth charted in the past two decades could place demands on the taxpayers of this province which may exceed their capacity or their desire to fill. Thus, I think it is entirely appropriate that at the beginning of a significant new decade for the arts, this government assess the directions and policies that will shape its commitment to the arts.

The special committee has the single objective of setting goals for the development of the arts in Ontario. Specifically, I have asked it to make recommendations concerning:

1. Appropriate areas for government involvement in the development of the arts in the 1980s;
2. The relationship between the ministry and its agencies and the appropriate roles for each in the development of the arts;
3. The role of the province in arts development compared to other political jurisdictions;
4. The most appropriate development and use of arts facilities;
5. The appropriate balance between government support, self-generated income and corporate and other private sponsorship; and
6. Methods of fostering greater self-sufficiency among arts organizations.

We may from time to time add other questions that are of relevance to the ministry and to the committee's work.

Committee members have been chosen for the independence of their opinions and the range of their experience. All share a considerable understanding of the arts and culture in Ontario. To facilitate both the speed and the effectiveness of the committee's work, it will consist of only three members and will keep its inquiries as informal and open as possible.

The committee will hold public hearings with artists and arts organizations across the province and then prepare a draft report for distribution to the arts community for comment. Following an open conference to guarantee the broadest possible input of public opinion, the committee will prepare its report and final recommendations. I have asked that this report be completed within the next nine months.

In closing, the committee will be chaired by Mr. Robert Macaulay, QC. Its members are Mr. Peter Day and Mrs. Geraldine Sherman. Secretary to the committee will be Mr. J. Douglas McCullough, assistant deputy minister of my ministry.

The formation of the special committee is another step in the orderly growth of the arts in Ontario. I am confident that with the assistance of the entire arts community, Ontario will continue to maintain a level of artistic activity second to none.

HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Snow), today I would like to table the Ministry of Transportation and Communications and the Ministry of Northern Affairs highway construction program for the fiscal year 1983-84.

My colleague the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Bernier) has released this report this afternoon in Sault Ste. Marie and Thunder Bay.

In all, an estimated \$336 million will be spent for construction on the King's highway system in northern and southern Ontario. In addition, we will be subsidizing municipal road construction for another \$246 million, which will generate about \$460 million in total expenditures when the municipalities' share is included.

In total, some \$796 million will be spent on projects considered essential to preserve the present quality of the existing system, a system that ensures the efficient transport of goods and people in Ontario.

3 p.m.

Briefly then, we are proposing new work on a total of 868 kilometres of the provincial system, primarily on two-lane highways, including scheduled construction of 129 bridges.

As part of the government's proposed expansion program under the direction of the Board of Industrial Leadership and Development, \$25 million is included for major highway projects in the Golden Horseshoe area.

MTC will continue to carry out the planning, design and construction of some 348 kilometres of provincial highways in northern Ontario, a system, as I am sure all members know, that is funded by the Ministry of Northern Affairs, which also sets the priorities for capital highway construction in the north.

Again, the majority of the work is primarily on two-lane highways, although the construction of passing lanes, truck climbing lanes and remote airports is also included. Details of all these projects and others are contained in the program I am now tabling, copies of which will go to all members via the legislative post office.

Mr. Speaker: Before proceeding, I would ask the co-operation of all members in limiting their private conversations to some place other than the chamber.

ORAL QUESTIONS

DEATHS AT HOSPITAL FOR SICK CHILDREN

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, if the Premier (Mr. Davis) has a statement on Minaki Lodge I will gladly hold down question period.

Mr. Speaker: Was that your question?

Hon. Mr. Davis: That is his first question. I have no statement; next question.

Mr. Peterson: The Premier would not recognize it, but that was high-quality humour he just heard.

I have a question for the Solicitor General with respect to his statement today. Can the Solicitor General be specific about the levels of digoxin that were found in the investigation? Obviously, there is a great deal of confusion between his statement and a variety of statements that have come out, statements of various ministry officials as well as what has been reported in the press. I do not see any clearing up of that confusion as a result of the minister's statement or that of the Minister of Health (Mr. Grossman) today. Can he be specific about the

levels of digoxin that have been found up to this point?

Hon. G. W. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, other than saying they are elevated levels I cannot enlighten the honourable member with any more information than that.

Mr. Peterson: Can he tell us if he has evidence that these were not homicides? Is that what he is saying or is he saying they were homicides? What is he saying to this House?

Hon. G. W. Taylor: I have not indicated at all that they are homicides nor have the police indicated that there is a homicide here. The statement indicates the levels of digoxin are elevated enough to cause the coroner concern so that he has called in the police to investigate the matter further. Further forensic laboratory tests are being conducted on the matter.

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, I take it from the minister's statement today the levels that were found were higher than the therapeutic level which might have been expected, given the fact that we understand the child was receiving digoxin as part of his therapeutic treatment. Is the minister in a position to tell us whether the levels that were found were anywhere near as high as those in the instances which have been described by the Centers for Disease Control in Atlanta, in the seven which they have said in their view could only have been caused by purposeful overdoses of digoxin? Can the minister enlighten us a little with respect to the situation?

Hon. G. W. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to inform the honourable member that they are above the normal levels that one would find for therapeutic purposes and they are sufficient to cause the coroner concern to investigate the matter. As to where they are on the latter part of the scale that he has asked to fit them into, some particular scale that would allow him more preciseness, I am not able to give that information at this time, as the tests are still being conducted.

Ms. Copps: Mr. Speaker, the minister is saying the digoxin levels were above the therapeutic level. In his statement he says Jack Ackroyd cannot indicate this death is a homicide. The Minister of Health in his statement quotes the Atlanta Centers for Disease Control, which state: "For the future it is important to recognize that no hospital is immune to the possibility of intentional harm to patients by hospital employees or others in the hospital." A

spokesman for the Attorney General's office yesterday said this particular incident seemed to bear very little or, in fact, no relationship to the previous deaths that are under investigation.

Obviously there seems to be a great deal of confusion from all sources on the government side, and I wonder if the minister might take this time to clarify just what the situation is.

Hon. G. W. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, I do not believe the honourable member has accurately quoted the spokesman for the Attorney General's office or put into the statement by the Minister of Health what is intended from the statements put forward today.

I cannot enlighten the House any more at this time, because we are still undertaking these very elaborate tests. They are not simple tests; they are very complicated. They are tests such that when you find a negative result, you proceed to another sort of positive result. The matter cannot be simplistically arrived at by saying, "Here is a scale, and here is the exact answer."

I would like to enlighten the House further on it but I cannot, because it is a very complicated forensic scientific procedure that is being conducted by the Centre of Forensic Sciences to resolve the further information on the matter.

NORCEN ENERGY RESOURCES LTD.

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations with respect to his statement today, which again sheds very little light on a subject that has become extremely complicated because of conflicting reports from a variety of sources.

Would the minister not agree with me that the statement he has given us does not give us any facts? In fact, he has prevented the public from making its own judgements on the basis of the reports of the investigators, and all we get is a gloss here off the top and have no further insight into this matter.

Given the gravity of the situation, given the aroma that this entire matter has had, why would he not use his discretion? He has gone a little bit of the way here: he has broken the principle of secrecy now. Why would he not go the entire way and lay before the public and this House a copy of the report of the investigators?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, let me speak quite honestly. I think there are some very important and substantive issues at stake here. First of all I think there is the integrity and respect that I have, the government has and, I trust, all members have for the individuals and

the members who make up the commission that regulates the financial markets of this province.

My own view—and I have absolute and firm confidence in the ability and the competence and the capability of those people—is that they have fulfilled their functions and their activities in a way that is beyond reproach.

What the honourable member is really saying is that, contrary to public policy in respect to individuals or corporations that undergo investigation, investigations in which a determination is made that no charges should be laid, those investigations should be public without regard to the effect on the individual or the corporation, or indeed on society and on the justice system as a whole. That is a philosophy I honestly cannot accept.

I know there are exceptional circumstances in this case, because it has been well publicized and because there were hearings in Cleveland and there has been a leak of the document. But that should not alter the fundamental obligation that we all feel is imposed upon and should be part of the confidentiality under which that commission operates with respect to investigative reports like this.

The commission has given this House, and therefore the public, a comprehensive review of the principles on which it reached its decision and has indicated what its decision was on the basis of the application of those principles. I feel and they feel that that is sufficient justification for the public. Remember that it is the unanimous decision of a commission which I feel is totally above reproach.

3:10 p.m.

Mr. Peterson: So the minister believes in semi-confidentiality. Would he not agree with me that that could lead to the conclusion that he is being self-serving in what he chooses to share with the public?

Given the myriad of other questions involved in this matter from different sides;

Given, apparently, the different point of view the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry) has from the minister on this matter and the fact that we still have not had an explanation for the dismissal of Mr. Johnston, that we still have no explanation for the different points of view of the various police forces, the investigative staff, with respect to the commission;

Given the fact there is a potential conflict of interest here—of course, I read the documents quickly and I noted the rationalization, the legal opinion, for the conflict of interest at the securities commission was dated yesterday, April

27, so it was a letter after the fact to cover the events preceding;

Given the fact that various people's reputations had been very lightly bandied about, including some by the minister and various members of his government;

Given the switch of position of the Attorney General in this whole matter over the last few months;

Given all those questions and many more, I would ask him whether it would not be fair to have an independent probe that would look at all the facts involved to make sure justice was being well served, and also to look into some of the subsequent matters with respect to the Securities Act, conflict of interest rules and a variety of other things, to make sure the minister does not again taint his own reputation and that of some of his regulatory bodies.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: First, I have never bandied anybody's name about, nor have I heard anybody question the integrity of any single member or group of members of that commission. With all respect, what we are talking about is the integrity of a system and the preservation of the individual's or corporation's right not to be unduly exposed.

I understand what the member is talking about in terms of the undue publicity this case has had and the amount of information that has been given to the public through the trials in other countries and through a leaked document, but to suggest a fundamental principle should be breached with respect to the release of information, when opposition members in this House have acknowledged there was apparently a thorough investigation, is beyond my comprehension.

I am thoroughly satisfied as to the process, and to suggest the fact that the letter from counsel was dated at some recent date really means—I am not criticizing, because I know the documents are lengthy, but if the member would read the documents, they say, "In confirmation of previous oral advice I gave you." This is not something pulled out of a hat. We are talking about solid, competent, capable, responsible citizens serving a role in this province of which we should be immensely proud.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the minister would allow me to say that his opinion of the members of the commission and mine are identical. That is not the matter at issue at present. Will the minister please consider in his capacity as minister his obligation to release the whole report of the investigation? If he does not

release that report, he will continue the damage that is being done to people's reputations in connection with that investigation by the inappropriate and improper way the action of the commission was carried out.

I have read what I believe to be the report. I consider myself relatively well informed in this matter. I also consider there is nothing in that report which, in the words of the minister's statement and in the quotation to him from the letter of the Ontario Securities Commission, will damage "a person's reputation when the results of the investigation do not support further proceedings." That is the question that was decided by the commission, that there would be no further proceedings under section 118. The report does not damage the reputation of those persons, because the evidence of those persons was accepted by the commission.

Will the minister now, in the light of the concern which is created and because of the inappropriateness of the procedures of the committee in deciding this matter, determine as minister to release that report?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, I could not disagree more totally with the member's concept as to any inappropriateness. Let me make it very clear that what he is really asking for is that this commission, and therefore other investigative bodies in this province, be they police or be they quasi-judicial, have a precedent set for them to release investigative documents on people where decisions have been made not to proceed with any charges. I find that such a fundamental principle that to breach it would, I think, raise a disrespect for that commission and for this Legislature and I do not intend to do it.

Mr. Peterson: I would implore the minister not to be intellectually dishonest in his answers of creating straw men, such as attacking the reputations of people on the—

Interjection.

Mr. Peterson: He is suggesting we are attacking the reputation of people on the Ontario Securities Commission, or he is suggesting that we are attacking some fundamental principles. He has quasi-broken the principle now and he cannot stand on it.

The issue is the regulatory capacity of his government. This is the issue of the trust companies, where he stands up and says, "I have looked into it, we are having an internal review and everything is fine." He knows damned well

that for two years there was complete incompetence right under his nose.

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

Mr. Peterson: We do not take his word for it. He has lost credibility with us in this House.

I am asking the minister, on the basis of the confusion that surrounded this case—the various noises that have come from the Attorney General, the police and a variety of others—would he not feel he was serving the system better to make this information public so we can form our own judgement? Surely that is fair in the circumstances, given the support of that position from the member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick).

Hon. Mr. Elgie: I suggest that the Premier (Mr. Davis) may want to dig out the horoscope on the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Peterson). I do not know what he is taking these days, but he is showing a degree of irresponsibility that I think behooves him not very well and which his party should be very distressed about. He can talk all the lovely talk he wants, but there is a very fundamental principle here. For him to suggest it should be breached, should be shocking to individual citizens and to the public in this province.

SECURITY AT HOSPITAL FOR SICK CHILDREN

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Solicitor General. It concerns the statement he made today and the one made by the Minister of Health (Mr. Grossman).

Can the Solicitor General tell us whether or not there were physical security measures in effect after March 1981 at the Hospital for Sick Children? Can he tell us whether there has been any change with respect to physical security at the hospital since that time? In particular, can he tell us whether there have been any changes as a result of the decision of the government to stop the criminal investigation and to move towards the establishment of the Grange commission?

I am sure the Solicitor General will understand the importance of that question in the light of many other questions which are being asked about the events which took place on Saturday. Can he tell us whether there have been any material changes in the nature of the physical security at the hospital from March 1981 until today?

Hon. G. W. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, I am not apprised of the exact information the member is

desiring, thus I cannot give him an answer to that precisely. It is a question he had better put to the Minister of Health, who is more familiar with the exact information on that question.

Mr. Rae: Could I ask the Solicitor General to redirect that question to the Minister of Health?

Hon. G. W. Taylor: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I outlined in my statement some of the steps that had been taken. I would assure the honourable member that other steps have been taken by the hospital which I think it would be inappropriate to disclose, because obviously if the hospital made public the security measures that have been taken it would make them virtually ineffective.

3:20 p.m.

Mr. Rae: I think the minister has slightly misunderstood the question I was asking. I was asking the minister whether he was aware of precisely what physical security steps were taken by the hospital from the time Susan Nelles was charged in March 1981. Can the minister tell us whether there have been any changes since that time?

I think that information is relevant in terms of what has happened over the last while. Can he tell us whether there have been any changes as a result of the decision of the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry) not to proceed with a criminal investigation and to shift over to the broader-range inquiry?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I have understood the question and I would refer the honourable member to pages 5 and 6 of my statement wherein several changes, but not all the changes, are listed. Again, to repeat, there are other changes that have been implemented to ensure patient safety, patient care and security, but it is not in the public interest to disclose those because it would make them ineffective.

Ms. Copps: Mr. Speaker, it seems in the statement the minister tabled in the House today, if he would refer to recommendation 96, there is a fairly lengthy discussion of security measures that should have been taken as a result of the Dubin inquiry. The recommendations specifically state, "Identification of all hospital personnel and visitors should be required as an additional security measure."

I note the response of the hospital to date has been that it is accepted in principle and is being studied. I ask the minister why is it being studied? Why has it not been implemented, when adequate time certainly has transpired

over the last few months for these changes to have taken place?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The Centers for Disease Control recommendation, dealing in the same area, expressed some concern about the particulars of the Dubin recommendations with regard to that. The hospital felt it was in the best interest of patients and families to go cautiously in that area from the standpoint of wanting to keep the hospital accessible while providing appropriate security.

Because of some other steps they have taken, which again we are not prepared to disclose, it is the hospital's opinion that just about an equivalent level of security has been maintained without needing to go to that sort of system which would undoubtedly change the atmosphere and feeling of care and openness that is available and most important to the patients in that particular area.

Mr. Rae: Perhaps I can phrase the question even more directly. Can the Minister of Health tell us whether, to his knowledge, any physical security measures that had previously been in place were relaxed at any time between March 1981 and Saturday? Can he tell us whether the physical measures that certainly would have been in place in March 1981 were relaxed? Can he tell us under what circumstances they were relaxed?

I am speaking specifically of physical security measures, and not in relation to many of the recommendations made by Mr. Justice Dubin and implemented by the hospital with respect to medical security.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If I have followed that phrasing carefully, I would report to the honourable member that all the measures in place as of last week, before this recent incident, were substantially better and more secure than they were in March 1981. In other words, there was no relaxation from March 1981 until last Friday.

Subsequent to the events of last Saturday, as a precautionary measure, some further rather extraordinary measures have been taken to increase the level of security once again.

CLOSURE OF CONSOLIDATED-BATHURST PLANT

Mr. Rae: My new question is to the Minister of Industry and Trade (Mr. Walker) who, along with the Minister of Labour (Mr. Ramsay), now has disappeared.

Mr. Speaker: He is not in his seat.

Mr. Rae: It would appear they are ready to stay here for extraordinarily lengthy statements by ministers, but not ready to stay for—

Hon. Mr. Elgie: He can hear you.

Mr. Rae: He is not here so it does not matter whether the honourable member can hear me or not, does it?

Interjection.

Mr. Rae: There he is. Fine.

Mr. Speaker: Put your question, please.

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, I understand the minister was present, as were a number of other individuals, at a meeting that took place this morning between officials of Consolidated-Bathurst and the Minister of Labour and himself.

I would like to ask the minister, given the fact he is aware the company refused even to meet with its own employees to make any adjustments with respect to its plans to close the plant in Hamilton, it refused to respond to the request by the employees that it consider an offer to sell, it would not "countenance any competition," as it put it—and how ironic in the light of the minister's halcyon statements to the free market system that he gives to the Empire Club from time to time; given these facts, does the minister not think it is time the government stopped meeting on its knees with these companies and that it simply pass legislation that would require companies, first, to make an offer to purchase to employees any time they are considering plant closure, and second, to justify their plant closures to a committee of this Legislature? Does he not think it is time we had that kind of legislation in place?

Hon. Mr. Walker: No.

Mr. Rae: The minister is nothing more nor less than a pathetic apologist for the corporate barons of this province.

As a shareholder or as a trustee for shareholders in Massey-Ferguson, how does the minister feel about a statement made yesterday in response to a question from another shareholder at the Massey-Ferguson annual meeting? How does he feel about the statement by Mr. Rice that there is a plan that the company be closed in Toronto, probably within the next two years?

Does the minister not think it is high time the companies told the workers their plans before they dropped them casually in conversations to shareholders? What steps does he intend to take, as somebody who is acting as a trustee for the people of this province with respect to their

shares in Massey-Ferguson, to make sure that jobs are protected in this province?

Hon. Mr. Walker: Mr. Speaker, I think something should be kept in mind here in respect to jobs in Ontario. Brantford is still in the province, and it was indicated that the jobs and the plant in essence would be moved to Brantford, Ontario, where, of course, there is equal need.

If we are talking about the plant itself, it is considered to be, and is, a very old, somewhat antique plant. It is a turn-of-the-century plant and, in the essence of efficiency, the company is presumably making some decision to change. There has been a rationalization by this company that has been substantial worldwide, with a whole host of companies closed all over the world in this particular firm.

Relative to the question of notifying people in advance, I think it was probably somewhat cavalier on the part of the individual not to have mentioned it first of all to the employees directly involved. On the other hand, to quote Mr. Barry Million, the acting vice-president of the United Auto Workers local: "I suppose we have more or less been expecting something like this, but it still comes as a surprise."

I admit a certain expectation has been going on here. I think the company was somewhat cavalier in not going to the employees first and explaining to them, rather than having it come out in the newspaper in the way it has. I think that is a mistake on the part of that corporation.

Ms. Coppins: Mr. Speaker, the minister was at the meeting this morning along with the rest of us, and I am sure he was just as shocked and surprised at the intransigence of Consolidated-Bathurst. Does he not agree that legislation should be brought in to make sure that when a company closes a plant, as is happening in the city of Hamilton, at the absolute least that company should give the workers first right of refusal at jobs in Consolidated-Bathurst plants in other areas—even that small concession that we were not able to wring from this company?

Hon. Mr. Walker: Mr. Speaker, I would say that I too was somewhat shocked, and I think somewhat surprised, at the intransigence of the company. I thought it would be a company somewhat more co-operative. As a matter of fact, the member will recall I stressed the view that I thought perhaps there was a major gap the company had failed to fill when shocking everybody with the announcement, because apparently at Christmas it was a plant that was going

to continue and suddenly on March 1 there was the announcement it would close.

I do think, frankly, they should be offering some first right in terms of succession or of transfer of employment in other parts of the province, and that it is a mistake on their part not to do that. They have shown some intransigence through all of this, indeed a great deal of intransigence throughout, and I think they have paid the price, as the member referred to it when he spoke at the meeting. They have suffered the price of corporate citizenship in this process.

3:30 p.m.

As to whether there should be a law to force them to sell to the employees, in a case like this I would have to disagree with that. I do not feel that would be the appropriate thing. It would be wrong under the circumstances to force a company to sell to the employees.

It is in the essence of that company's best interest and, therefore, that of the employees of that company on a province-wide basis. There are three other plants in the province, in St. Thomas, Etobicoke and Belleville. I am sure it is in the essence of maintaining those three plants as strong, viable components that they ultimately rationalize.

At one point they offered to open the books to be looked at. At another point, after I had to leave the meeting, they indicated they were not too anxious to have anyone look at the books. That is something I would be prepared to pursue with them to determine whether there are the losses they are maintaining there are. I think such information could be supplied to employees and, therefore, there might be some understanding on their part.

The mistake that company is making is in not getting the message across to people that there may be a problem. They claim poor sales and they claim the company has been losing money for more than five years. The mistake they are making is not getting that message out. I think the member would agree with me.

Mr. Mackenzie: Mr. Speaker, the minister will be aware that the recovery we seem to be talking about in our economy appears to be a profit recovery and not a recovery as far as workers are concerned.

The minister is aware that at that same meeting the company officials not only refused to give any preference to the workers in terms of transfers to other operations of Consolidated-Bathurst but when they were asked if they

would intervene in terms of Reed, the company they are selling it to, as to whether they would attempt to get some preference for the workers in that plant, the company's answer was it would not interfere, it would not make that recommendation, and that company would get its labour on the market just as they did.

Are we now considering the workers in an operation like this are nothing but a market commodity? Is that exactly what we are down to in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Walker: Mr. Speaker, there is no question this company has made a botch-up of its public relations, of its employee relations and of its labour relations. There is no question that has happened.

Mr. Cooke: They just follow your philosophy.

Mr. Rae: They are just doing what you tell them to.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Walker: Mr. Speaker, would you invite the noisy one in the second row to desist for a moment until I finish the answer? I think it is sincere concern.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Will the minister proceed with his answer?

Hon. Mr. Walker: I feel there should be some preference extended to the employees in terms of other operations. I do not think that extends to dislocating people who are already working there, but in terms of any potential employment elsewhere, perhaps because of increased work load in the other centres, that should be extended to them. I feel they are making a mistake in that regard.

I do feel there was some positive aspect to this in respect of Reed, the neighbour, as a possibility. I would like to see that explored. I will put the services of my ministry fully at the disposal of trying to help that situation.

EDUCATION LEGISLATION

Mr. Bradley: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Education (Miss Stephenson) and the Premier (Mr. Davis), to whom I might have put this question, I would like to direct this question to the Provincial Secretary for Social Development, who was kind enough to stay.

On many occasions, members of the Legislature have expressed their frustration with the lack of adequate opportunity to deal in a detailed way with the very complex issues that confront education. When Bill 127 came for-

ward and when other legislation such as Bill 19 came forward, we noted that people used those occasions to bring all their frustrations about the educational system to the attention of the members of the Legislature.

Would the Provincial Secretary for Social Development be prepared to endorse the suggestion that a select committee on education be struck to deal with the many issues, such as the implementation of Bill 82, the implementation and recommendations of the secondary education review project report, the pooling of assessment of a commercial and industrial nature and the entire funding issue as it relates to education? Would she be prepared to support that to members of the cabinet?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member will know, of course, that this government has always attempted to provide a great deal of opportunity for consultation, regardless of the programs or the legislation that was being introduced. He will also know that I am not in a position today to make any such endorsement, but I will certainly pass it along to my colleague.

Mr. Bradley: Would the minister, as the policy minister in that entire area, not agree with me that a select committee on education, which the member for Oakwood (Mr. Grande) and I have advocated on many occasions as a reasonable vehicle to deal with educational issues, would be a good forum for the public to have the kind of input it deserves on education issues?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: As I have indicated, I will pass that suggestion along to my colleague.

Mr. Grande: Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the intent of that question was, but ever since 1978 this party has been calling for a select all-party committee on education. The government has bucked that and does not want to do it.

What fears do the government have about the way the education system is in this province that lead them to the conclusion that they do not want parental involvement in the educational process in this province?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Mr. Speaker, I think if the honourable member will recall the hours and the days that were spent in consultation before that legislation was implemented, he will appreciate that we have nothing to fear. We welcome as much consultation as possible.

GASOLINE PRICES

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Speaker, I have a question

for the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations. Given the fact that as recently as last Sunday No. 2 gas was selling for 21.9 cents a litre in Thunder Bay, 53 cents a litre in Schreiber and \$1.40 a litre in Fort Severn, all in Ontario, will the minister and his colleagues consider establishing a commission of inquiry to investigate the ridiculous pricing of gasoline, an essential product, in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the member knows, as all of us do, that there are certainly pricing differences, usually based on competition and the presence of—

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: No, competition within a large centre. You know that. Go to Sudbury from a smaller community and you know there are gas wars going on and they bring about lower prices. If you are opposed to that, then stand up and say so. You want all the prices to be high. I mean, state your position. Or would you just nationalize everything and solve the whole world's problems and have everybody out of work?

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Seriously, I would suggest to the honourable member that the federal government already has a commission of inquiry into petroleum marketing and pricing at the present time and I have no doubt that they will address those matters in their report.

Mr. Stokes: Given the fact that the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations, more than any other of the 27-odd ministries in this government, has the responsibility for consumer protection and for making sure there is some semblance of order in the marketplace, does the minister not feel it is part of his responsibility to the consumers of this province, when he gets wide discrepancies such as I noted in my original question, to bring about some semblance of order with regard to the price of gasoline in this province?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: I can only reiterate what I have said in the past when this question has been asked. If there are those in this Legislature who feel that in our constitutional makeup in this country we should duplicate activities, nevertheless disregarding the obligations we have to taxpayers, then so be it. This government's position is very clear. With the federal government's commission of inquiry into the market-

ing of petroleum products taking place, we see no reason to duplicate that process.

3:40 p.m.

SUDBURY ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY

Mr. Elston: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of the Environment. Today we had an announcement dealing with acid rain. A couple of statements made in that announcement indicated that the mutual concern of New York and Ontario is "to apply the best possible science to study," and then it goes on, "to ensure that effective action is taken." Is the minister prepared to make a statement now that he will be following some of the recommendations or observations that followed from the Sudbury study on Inco and Falconbridge, which will require the reduction of emissions by the use of the most up-to-date technology available to eliminate those emissions?

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member knows that from the outset the objectives of this province have been very clear both in general terms and with respect to the situation in Sudbury. Surely he is also aware that we have been awaiting the detailed review of the consultants' work or the task force's work on the most appropriate technology to carry the smelter operations to the next step in terms of reductions. As of this year they will have been reduced by 70 per cent from their peak emission periods. Obviously the next phase is becoming much more complex and costly, perhaps requiring some very substantial rebuilding of the plants. I can tell the member that I have now begun to receive the analyses of the companies involved.

Mr. Elston: How costly?

Hon. Mr. Norton: I can assure the member they are very substantial. In fact, the companies have put several millions of dollars into detailed consultants' work on appropriate technologies as well.

That is going to take a little further time to review, but I hope in the relatively near future I will be in a position to discuss the whole issue more broadly with my federal colleague the Honourable John Roberts and with my other provincial colleagues. Obviously we have been engaged for some time now in developing an overall Canadian strategy of which we are a significant part. This information will be critical in determining the allocation of reductions on a broader basis in Canada so that we can live up to

our already stated commitment of a 50 per cent reduction in sulphur emissions in this country.

Mr. Elston: I realize there is a great deal of restudying and rehashing of the material that went into that study. So that we know what the minister is up to, is he prepared to set a time frame for its implementation or at least for the making of recommendations with respect to this study? It seems to me that for years on end we have been getting nothing but study after study and no time frame. As a result, no action is being taken.

Hon. Mr. Norton: That is a very self-serving question on the part of the member. He fails to recognize that this jurisdiction has taken some very decisive action on this issue. If he only did his homework a little more thoroughly he would have a better grasp on the complexity of the issue as far as the next step is concerned.

Could the member name any other jurisdiction in which there is in law, by way of regulation, a requirement that the major utility must reduce by 43 per cent over the next seven years? No, he could not. Could the member cite other jurisdictions that have already achieved the kinds of reductions we have? No, he could not.

I think it is important that he recognize at least the commitment that exists in this province and, furthermore, take the time to look at the report in some detail so that at least he can understand, or I hope have somebody explain to him, that it really is a very complex issue that involves not only specific measures with respect to Inco and Falconbridge but, on a much broader base, other corporations in this country. Therefore, it has to be part of our broader strategy for achieving the further 50 per cent reduction.

Mr. Elston: Since the minister has asked me, I can provide him with some answers if he requires my help.

Mr. Speaker: As a matter of fact, I think not.

Mr. Elston: I am willing to give that to him.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Laughren: Mr. Speaker, I shall try not to offend the sensitivities of the Minister of the Environment.

Having read the report very carefully and, on behalf of my colleague the member for Sudbury East (Mr. Martel) and our Environment critic the member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Charlton), having presented our options to the minister—since he has had our position since January—can the minister tell us why he will not seriously consider our option, which was to

have Inco reduce its acceptable levels from the present 1,950 tons a day to 43 tons a day, and because of the cash-flow problems of both Inco and Falconbridge that there be upfront money provided now on the part of this government in the form of either loan guarantees, loans or equity participation?

First, why has the minister not responded to our position? Second, will he tell us what his position is in regard to those options which we presented to him?

Mr. Speaker: The question is, why have you not responded to their position?

Mr. Laughren: No, no. That is not the question.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, it was inviting a little more complete response to that, even though the honourable member perhaps failed to express it as articulately as he might. One can surely extrapolate a little from that question.

Mr. Speaker: Not really.

Mr. Elston: Keith, do you want somebody else to answer it for you?

Hon. Mr. Norton: No, I know the answer precisely. The fact of the matter is that the member's proposal, which even if he were being candid he would have to admit was not really based upon any in-depth analysis but really quite a superficial knee-jerk reaction to the report, although I do give him credit for having read the report; I am not sure that anyone in this party over here has—

Mr. Elston: Wrong again.

Hon. Mr. Norton: We will give the member a chance to recite the critical passages.

Obviously his input will be taken into consideration in the overall deliberations. In terms of the specific strategy for dealing with the next major step, which I am sure he, if he has read the report, understands may cost up to \$1 billion, that strategy is something which will be an integral part of the ongoing meetings that I am having with my other provincial colleagues and my federal colleague in order to try to develop a comprehensive strategy across the country.

NORCEN ENERGY RESOURCES LTD.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations.

In the statement he made today, when he got to the bottom of the page and said they wanted to depart from their tradition in order to correct some fundamental misunderstandings of the Ontario Securities Commission's procedures, I

thought they were going to own up to the fact that they had goofed in their process, but apparently that was not so.

When the commission has stated, as it has throughout, that its decision was not to prosecute Norcen Energy Resources Ltd., Conrad M. Black and Edward G. Battle on certain counts under section 118 of the Ontario Securities Act—offences which if committed would result in jail sentences or fines or both—in his capacity as minister and as a lawyer I want to ask the minister if he calls that an administrative decision of the commission or a judicial, or as we lawyers like to say, quasi-judicial decision? Which of those two alternatives does the minister call a decision with respect to the prosecution of a citizen?

3:50 p.m.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, it may be a subject that the honourable member wishes to debate somewhere at some time, but I think the answer is very clearly put before him in the documents I have tabled in the House today, where it is clearly viewed by the commission under its statutory obligations for due administration of the act as an administrative process at that stage.

Mr. Renwick: The minister in his responses in this House on two or three occasions constantly refers to it as an administrative decision, but I noticed in the report in the *Globe and Mail* yesterday morning by correspondent Sylvia Stead that he referred to it as a quasi-judicial decision. He knows it is a judicial decision; he knows it is not an administrative decision.

My supplementary question to the minister is—

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege: I do not know that, and the documentation I have put before the House from the securities commission supports the position I have taken. So the member cannot say that I know that is not so.

Mr. Speaker: Will the member for Riverdale place a supplementary, please.

Mr. Renwick: I was curious to hear the minister's colleague the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry) on the Metro Morning program indicate the other day, in his delightfully facile, ad lib way when he is dealing with intricate legal problems, that the commission has a prosecutorial discretion as to whether or not it will make a decision with respect to prosecution.

Does the minister know of any prosecutorial discretion in the Ontario Securities Commission

with respect to whether charges, when evidence is available, will or will not be laid? If so, would he point out to me where that prosecutorial discretion is conferred on the commission?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, I think the act, as the member will know, really speaks for itself. A determination is made by the commission, who are advisers to me with respect to matters before them, when it is necessary to consult me as a result of the statutory obligation they have. Therefore, the act clearly states that if a decision is made to commence such a prosecution, they must have the consent of the minister. So I do not understand what the member is saying. It is clearly laid down in the legislation.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the exchange of the minister with the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Peterson) and the member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick) and I understand the minister's concern about establishing what he considers a bad precedent, that when an investigation is made and no charges are laid one does not usually release a report. I understand that; I think most of us understand that.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Your leader doesn't.

Mr. Roy: My leader understands that perfectly.

Mr. Speaker: Never mind the interjections, please.

Mr. Roy: What my leader does not understand is that you change your position. That is what he does not understand.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Will the member please place his supplementary?

Mr. Roy: I was provoked. You noticed that.

Mr. Speaker: Never mind.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, how can the minister be afraid of establishing a precedent when he himself has bandied about certain names and some of the individuals involved here feel they have not been properly and judicially treated by the ministry by having their names bandied about?

Second, how can the minister fear establishing a precedent when we have a situation in which a commission is challenged by the police force and challenged by the law officers of the crown and, in fact, the minister has refused to allow the Attorney General to proceed with a prosecution? That is not an ordinary case.

Why is the minister afraid of establishing a precedent and why is he afraid of giving us the evidence? He wants us to accept his word. We want the evidence that the decision not to prosecute was justified.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Once again, Mr. Speaker, and I realize it is Friday tomorrow and we may all be planning to leave very shortly, there seems to be a fundamental—well, I have got to get my pen out if I am going to copy. There seems to be a fundamental misunderstanding. I want to say this to the member straight out and with full force.

Let me just clear the record with respect to some of the issues raised. I have got to get my pen out again, or can I get along without that?

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: I do not need the pen.

I have not bandied names about, and if the member reads that statement and reads those letters, there have been principles discussed. No names have been bandied about. I think to say so is inappropriate. With respect, to suggest I have refused to allow the Attorney General to proceed shows a total lack of understanding of the process and shows the member has not read anything; not a thing.

Mr. Roy: You refused through the commission.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: The Attorney General clearly wrote to me, as I have said and he has said, asking that the commission review and reconsider its decision, acknowledging as he does and as I do that the legislation in this province creates a securities commission to perform a quasi-judicial and judicial role, and that it is the adviser to the minister who reports on behalf of its administration of that statute to this Legislature.

There has been no refusal to the Attorney General with respect to the laying of charges. Let us have that clear. The member has raised that before and he does not understand the issue.

With respect to the challenge by the police, there is no such evidence I know of. Clearly there are members of the Attorney General's staff who have a view with respect to the inferences that may be drawn from investigative documents. In the view of the commission, it is its obligation, with the knowledge it has and with the guidelines and understanding it has of the industry, to apply that knowledge to the information available and the inferences that can be drawn from it. It has done that and reached its conclusion.

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege: I think it is important at this point, given this discussion, to make the record clear.

I quote from information filed today, a letter from Mr. Dey to the minister, which says on page 3: "The commission's unanimous decision

was not to recommend a prosecution under the act and was not varied following the special meeting earlier this evening. The commission also decided that, although it would not actively oppose your consenting to any request for a prosecution made by the Attorney General, it would inform you of its clear decision following the special meeting."

I think that sheds some light.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege: I think it is entirely inappropriate. I appreciate there has not been much time to read all the documents, but a full and complete reading of the documents would make it clear to the Leader of the Opposition that the commission sees its role as one of advising this minister. Any role for the Attorney General with respect to requesting that a charge be laid by me is not within the scope of that legislation, nor their view of how the act should function.

What they have said is they would not contemplate any vigorous public objection if such a request were made, but they clearly see it would have been an improper request.

Mr. Peterson: On the point of privilege, it is just being patently silly—

Mr. Speaker: Order. Will the Leader of the Opposition please resume his seat?

Mr. Peterson: Clearly he has an authority to do so. That is what the letter says. He has no right to stand up and misrepresent—

Mr. Speaker: New question.

EDUCATION FOR MENTALLY HANDICAPPED

Mr. Haggerty: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Community and Social Services. As he is aware from the question asked of the Minister of Education (Miss Stephenson) last Friday by my colleague the member for St. Catharines (Mr. Bradley), parents of profoundly and severely mentally retarded children are extremely concerned about the implementation of Bill 82 and its effect upon their education.

Would the minister give consideration to attempting to persuade the Minister of Education to amend the necessary regulations or legislation necessary to permit these children to continue to be educated in the developmental centres operated by associations for the mentally retarded and funded by the Ministry of Community and Social Services?

Mr. Riddell: Frank Drea wants to close them down.

Hon. Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, before I answer that, I will handle the aside.

Mr. Speaker: Never mind the aside, please.

Hon. Mr. Drea: He and his leader got run out of Bluewater the other night after they abandoned the parents. They should not forget it.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Drea: They abandoned them. They walked out on them.

Mr. Riddell: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege—

Mr. Speaker: Order. There is no privilege. The member for Huron-Middlesex—

Mr. Riddell: That is a misrepresentation of what went on. There is no way we abandoned the parents. We stayed there until the bitter end. Now tell the truth.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Interjections.

4 p.m.

Mr. Eakins: You sneak your information, like Larry.

Mr. Speaker: Never mind. The Minister of Community and Social Services.

Mr. Eakins: Larry must have told you how to get the information.

Mr. Speaker: Never mind the interjection, please.

Hon. Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, I will ignore the interjection seeing it is from the calibre of person it came from.

Mr. Speaker: Now to the question, please.

Hon. Mr. Drea: And where he spent his day before he came here.

Quite honestly, I do not think there is the problem the member raises and, I believe, the member for St. Catharines raised last week. As far as my ministry is concerned, we do not think Bill 82 will make any difference in the funding arrangements or in the ability of the particular children to receive the education they have received. There is already the commitment, which I believe was given last Thursday or Friday by the Minister of Education, that if there is a problem, she will move to remedy it.

While I do appreciate the concern of the member, any fears that have been raised are unwarranted.

Mr. Bradley: What the minister is saying is that the situation for those children as it exists will not change. They will still go out to the

developmental centres, they will still be educated in the developmental centres and nothing will change, despite the implementation of Bill 82. Is that what he is saying to us? Because if it is, they will be quite pleased with it. If it is not, is the minister prepared to persuade the Minister of Education to amend Bill 82 to permit it?

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Drea: I do not agree with the phraseology used by the member. However, in terms of the principle, as I said just a moment ago, neither the Minister of Education nor I sees the difficulty that is perceived by the group in Niagara concerning this matter. However, as she has already stated, if there is that problem, she will move to remedy it. In essence, as to who pays for the education and how it is arranged and provided, there will be no change.

DIGITAL CLOCK IN CHAMBER

Mr. Gordon: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege. Not only am I offended as a member of this House, but I think the people of Ontario will be offended. When they come to this chamber, they expect to see a chamber that has some history and some tradition to it. When I look at those digital obscenities across the way, I can only come to one conclusion: the only thing that did not happen a few minutes ago was for a siren to go off.

Whoever is responsible for them should take them out. Nobody on our side asked for them that I am aware of. I did not hear any member of my caucus stand up and say, "I want a clock." I notice the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk (Mr. Nixon), the former Leader of the Opposition, is not here today. I am sure if he were here, he would be up saying something about those digital obscenities.

Mr. Speaker: The member for St. Catharines, on the same point?

Mr. Bradley: Yes. The same point of privilege.

Mr. Speaker: It is not really a point of privilege.

Mr. Bradley: Whatever you consider it to be a point of, I am prepared to comment.

Mr. Speaker: It is not even a point of interest.

Mr. Bradley: On a point of privilege—

Mr. Speaker: The member is totally wrong in his assumptions, and it is just not correct.

Mr. Roy: He usually is.

Mr. Gordon: Nobody consulted me.

Mr. Speaker: I am not going to argue. Order.
[Later]

Mr. Bradley: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: It would be useful for all members, because I have an entirely different understanding from that of the member for Sudbury (Mr. Gordon), for you to explain to us how it came about that we have this timing device in here. I think I fully understand why it is here and what prompted its installation in the chamber. But perhaps you could explain for the member for Sudbury just how this came about, because there is a very logical explanation. I think it would be very useful.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, I just want to say on the point of order that it is interesting the member for Sudbury has revealed the basic attitude of his party towards technology, change and progress in the province as a whole. Now that we have digital time recorders in the House, we might even dare to have real television in the House in order that the people of the province would know what was happening in this place.

Mr. Speaker: All these decisions, of course, will be made by the members.

Mr. Gordon: How about a cuckoo clock?

Mr. Riddell: All we need to do is hang you on the wall.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Barlow: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege: I would like to point out to you, sir, and to the House, that I notice what is probably an error in the sheet headed Business for Thursday. The standing committee on resources development, it says, was to have met this morning at 10. However, the Orders and Notices is correct when it says eight o'clock this evening. I would like to point out to members of the House that we did not meet this morning; we are going to meet this evening.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. I am sure we are all better informed.

TRUST COMPANIES

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege with respect to my statement of April 19 regarding the trust companies. I would not want members of this House to think I had misled them with respect to the—

Mr. Kerrio: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker—

An hon. member: Sit down.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. R. F. Johnston: I would like a point of

order to his point of order to his point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps we could just calm down. I ask the member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Kerrio) to resume his seat, please.

Mr. Kerrio: You haven't heard my point of order.

Mr. Stokes: Sit down, Vince.

Mr. Speaker: Come on, sit down. Resume your seat.

The minister rose on a point of privilege, which takes precedence over a point of order. I will hear the minister, and then I will hear anybody else who wishes to rise on something.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, I would not want the members of this House to think I had misled them in my statement of April 19 with respect to the net amounts of money that the Canada Deposit Insurance Corp. had been required to advance to date with respect to the three trust companies.

The amounts I gave with respect to Seaway Trust and Greymac Trust were reversed. They should be Seaway Trust \$7.5 million and Greymac Trust \$33.5 million, instead of the reverse. The amount for Crown Trust is as stated.

PETITION

GAS PRICES

Mr. Kerrio: Mr. Speaker, I have a petition directed to the Honourable John Black Aird, Lieutenant Governor of Ontario, and I would like it directed to the attention of the Minister of Energy (Mr. Welch). It is signed by 375 petitioners from my area, and it reads as follows:

"The undersigned wish to"—

Mr. Martel: The member for Sudbury (Mr. Gordon) should stay and hear where it came from.

Mr. Kerrio: Mr. Speaker, do I have to listen to that interjection? This is a pretty important petition.

Mr. Speaker: Of course it is, and I ask all the honourable members to give the member for Niagara Falls their undivided attention while he presents this petition on behalf of his constituents. Will the member for Niagara Falls please address the chair?

Mr. Kerrio: Mr. Speaker, this petition is signed by 375 constituents from the great riding of Niagara who wish to signify their dissatisfaction with and strong disapproval of the grossly escalating gas rates. Many of these people are on fixed incomes. I concur with their feeling

about the gas rates and support their position. I hope the government will take the necessary steps to reduce those costs.

MOTION

CITY OF TORONTO BILL

Hon. Mr. Gregory: Mr. Speaker, I move that in its consideration of Bill Pr3, An Act respecting the City of Toronto, previously before the House in the second session of this parliament as Bill Pr13, the standing committee on regulations and other statutory instruments may consider the proceedings taken before the standing committee on administration of justice on Bill Pr13 in the second session.

Motion agreed to.

4:10 p.m.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

MINISTRY OF GOVERNMENT SERVICES AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Wiseman moved, seconded by **Hon. Mr. Gregory**, first reading of Bill 23, An Act to amend the Ministry of Government Services Act.

Motion agreed to.

EDUCATION AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Cooke moved, seconded by **Mr. Grande**, first reading of Bill 24, An Act to amend the Education Act.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Cooke: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill, among other things, is to give parents and interested citizens the right to appeal school closings to the Ontario Municipal Board.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE (continued)

Resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

Mr. Kolyn: Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure for me to participate in this afternoon's debate and a timely opportunity to qualify my strong support for the throne speech. I recognize that the members opposite will disagree with the brief comments I shall make this afternoon, but I understand that their role is to be negative.

Today I would like to be positive—positive about one particular industry that is of special

interest to my Lakeshore constituents and positive about the role this government would like to see the industry take. I am referring, of course, to the province's automobile industry, the nucleus of Ontario's manufacturing sector.

As all members know, automobiles account directly or indirectly for one out of every six jobs in the province. An estimated 20 per cent of Ontario's economy depends on the industry. Moreover, 95 per cent of the country's auto manufacturing is concentrated here in Ontario, a testament to Canada's dependence on the vitality of our province's auto sector.

These statistics underscore the significant contribution that automobiles make to the provincial economy and, indeed, to the national economy. But it is no secret that the industry throughout North America has fallen on hard times. Beset by a slumping economy, high interest rates, rising energy costs and changing consumer preferences, North American auto makers have also had to contend with intense competition from low-cost imports.

Currently, imported cars account for approximately one third of the market, with Japan alone enjoying 22 per cent of the market share. In fact, Japanese penetration into automobile markets is a world wide phenomenon: auto production throughout western Europe has fallen dramatically as a result of increased Japanese competition.

From 1980 to 1981, French output was down by 11 per cent, British production fell by 12 per cent and Italian output decreased by nine per cent. By comparison, North American production in the same period was down by only 1.8 per cent. Clearly, the problems affecting the province's auto industry are prevalent in a global context.

What is of interest to this government is the timing and structure of a recovery strategy. To this end, our government has taken an active role in the rebuilding process of the auto industry, outlining in precise terms the policy that we as a country should be following to get the industry back on its feet. Sadly, leadership has been lacking from Ottawa; and make no mistake about it, we are dearly paying the consequences.

On page 10 of the throne speech, presented last week by the Lieutenant Governor, our government reaffirmed its commitment towards a more just policy on automobile trade. The two brief sentences read as follows:

"In this regard, as a short-term measure, we continue to advocate, in the strongest possible

terms, restriction in the number of imported cars to allow domestic industry time to adjust to the new circumstances and, more important, to permit time to obtain agreement from foreign manufacturers to increase significantly Canadian content in their products. Since we are not satisfied that federal officials are acting vigorously enough on this matter, we intend to increase our own efforts."

Our government's resolve to improve the deal that Canada gets from the world's major auto makers is both a sound and sensible policy. Foreign automobile exporters oppose import and content restrictions because of the added trouble it causes. None the less, manufacturing countries the world over have in place tough, broad trade measures which protect their domestic industries and their national interests.

For example, Italy has a one-for-one trade agreement with Japan, up to 2,000 cars each. France allows only three per cent of the market to be taken by the Japanese, while the Austrians, who require 85 per cent local content, restrict imports to 20 per cent of the market by levying duties of 58 per cent.

Last year, the Japanese agreed to hold exports to the United States to 1.68 million units, the same level as 1981. At the same time, the Americans were promised \$300 million annually in parts purchases. Moreover, two Japanese auto firms, Honda and Datsun, have undertaken construction of vehicle assembly plants in the United States. The Japanese volunteered concessions because impending legislation was already in Congress. It is the old American logo of a little bit of arm-twisting.

There are two elements to these trade measures which are worth emphasizing. First, Canada should not be hesitant in its negotiations with Japanese car manufacturers. This country is the seventh largest market for motor vehicles in the free world. It is our responsibility as a country to ensure that the Japanese return a portion of their earnings to Canada in the form of investments and jobs for Canadians.

If we are not going to stand up as an equal partner in this trade relationship, as every other industrialized country already has, we should not expect the Japanese to volunteer benefits to Canada. I believe in fair trade, not free trade.

4:20 p.m.

Second, the misguided notion that Canada is not in a strong trade position with Japan is just that: misguided. Like Australia, Canada by and large exchanges raw and semi-processed resources with Japan in return for processed and manufac-

tured goods. But whereas the Australian government has successfully negotiated an intelligent, effective agreement with the Japanese, the Liberal government here in Canada appears to be ready to act only when it is too late. If Australia can do it, why can we not?

I have spoken at length about this particular facet of the automobile trade, because I feel very strongly that Canada is simply not getting a fair deal. Our government has tabled several proposals in regard to the auto trade which would improve the country's trade position so as to give Ottawa much-needed direction and purpose. However, it should also be evident that until the federal government of this country comes to grips with the gravity of the situation in the auto sector, little can be accomplished and negligible progress can be made.

This is not to say that responsibility for the current difficulties being experienced by the auto industry is solely in the domain of the federal government. Even the current federal government and its Prime Minister, Mr. Trudeau, deserve fair treatment. In fact, the hard times that have befallen Canada's automobile makers are also the responsibility of the unions and the industry itself.

To illustrate my point, I would like to recall briefly the events of a strike at one of the major auto makers in 1979. At that time, the issue was money to the unions and automation to the company. The unions believed that higher wages were appropriate because, among other things, the small car being built at the plant was popular in the United States and the Canadian dollar had been dramatically discounted as a result of the exchange rate. The company was adamant that a new production process incorporating significant robotics technology was necessary for the plant's long-term viability.

When the smoke had cleared, the unions and management could not co-operate on a strategy mutually beneficial to each; the unions won higher wages, although they were later outstripped by rampaging inflation in 1980, 1981 and 1982, and the company decided against a \$100-million investment plan for the Ontario plant. Today, every unit of that same popular car is being made in Wisconsin.

The reason for this shift is simple: the workers and management in Kenosha, Wisconsin, realized that Japanese penetration into the North American car markets was a long-term threat to their job security. As a result, the unions negotiated for job security instead of wages, and management went ahead with the necessary

automation. Thus, while American plants are correcting productivity problems to compete with the Japanese, Canadians are failing to realize that parity in productivity is the key to international competition.

In the early 1970s, when the Japanese wanted to know more about robotics, where did they go? They came to the National Research Council in Ottawa, which at that time was among the world leaders in basic robotics. All this knowledge was free for the asking, but Canadian industry did not seize the ideas and build them into practical, money-making enterprises. As a result, 10 years later, we are in a position of catching up with the nations that have been using our own expertise to capture world markets.

The moral of the story is quite brief. In today's world, unions and management will be made obsolete if they compete against each other. The real competition is outside our borders.

Moreover, technology is here and here to stay. Robotics technology is one of the big reasons Japanese imports are so competitive. A recent study conducted in Canada found the hourly wage of an assembly-line employee is three to four times as high as the combined capital and maintenance of a robot.

Furthermore, the adaptation towards robotics improves production flexibility and quality control. This fact is particularly evident given the prevalence of small cars in today's market. Because tolerances are much more precise, the need for robotics has become even more crucial.

With the competitive realities of robots and automated production systems a matter of record, our government is increasing its commitment to research and development in the field. The \$40-million centres for robotics and computer-assisted design will accelerate the pace of research into these most powerful of productive processes.

Moreover, the \$25-million auto parts technology centre in St. Catharines will promote technological development in the industry and integrate the increasing contributions from computers, new materials and design procedures with current production expertise.

Robotics represents the future, but we need to preserve our auto industry to make it relevant.

I would like to conclude my remarks by summarizing the key determinants of Ontario's strategy for long-term stability in the auto sector.

1. Protecting Canada's interests: Our government is on record as favouring temporary

import restrictions to enable negotiations between foreign auto makers and Canada on the subject of content requirements. It is imperative that Ottawa act now on behalf of all Canadians to protect jobs and incomes here in Canada.

I also want to add that I am personally in favour of an investigation by the federal Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce into questionable trade practices by the Japanese government. In fact, I have recently forwarded a letter in this regard to the minister, the Honourable Ed Lumley, and I want briefly to relay its significant passages to the House.

"It is incumbent upon the government of Canada to ascertain whether our faltering position in the international automobile market is related to unfair trade practices from abroad. I can suggest two areas where inquiries should be made.

"Currency manipulation: Between the years 1978 and 1982, the Japanese yen depreciated by more than 50 per cent in the US despite modest inflation and high rates of growth in Japan. This result has favoured Japan because their exports have become cheaper in American and Canadian markets.

"Conventional economic analysis suggests that the yen should have strengthened rather than weakened under the circumstances. Accordingly, it is entirely possible that the Japanese government has purposefully manipulated exchange markets to enhance the competitiveness of Japanese products, particularly automobiles. If this is the case, would you not agree that offsetting measures are called for from the government of Canada?"

"Structural protectionism: Once again, consider the Japanese experience. In that country (and increasingly several others), key industries with high export potential enjoy preferential domestic treatment until they are strong enough to compete overseas. Regulations prohibiting foreign competition in the home market are largely bureaucratic to discourage interested exporters abroad. Moreover, domestic enterprises ready to enter foreign markets enjoy advantages unheard of in our country. These include accelerated depreciation and special reserves for tax purposes, exemption from anti-trust laws, subsidized low-interest loans and government-funded research.

4:30 p.m.

"That governments should provide essential support and protective services to industry is beyond question. But if government intervention constitutes a breach of fair trade between

nations, would you not agree that counterbalancing policies should be developed to protect the interests of Canada?

"I pose these important questions to you on behalf of my Lakeshore constituents, who are justly concerned about the ongoing viability of Canada's automobile industry. We do not ask for extraordinary intervention from any government, nor should we expect to receive it. But consider our dilemma: If Canadian products are unable to compete worldwide because of unfair trade practices from abroad, or if Canadian jobs are lost because foreign competitors sell us products with no commitment to having them produced locally, who speaks for Canada?"

This letter was sent to the Honourable Ed Lumley one week ago. If any member opposite would like a copy of the complete text, I would happy to forward it to him.

2. The importance of technology: Our government has continued to support the development of technological research, particularly in the vital automobile field. Increasingly the competitive edge in the automobile industry will be a function of technological efficiency on the assembly line. For Canada to compete, the domestic auto makers must welcome innovation by investing in Canadian plants and Canadian equipment.

Before I move on to a third and most critical strategic requirement for Ontario's economic recovery I would like to mention again that an excellent series on technological integration appeared in the March and April editions of the *Atlantic Monthly*. In a two-part exposition of the subject by Harvard professor Robert Reich, the complex issue of technological restructuring, job training for post-industrial tasks and the liabilities of ignoring foreign competition are dealt with in a convincing and informative manner. I heartily recommend that all members endeavour to read it. I was pleased to hear my colleague the member for Prince Edward-Lennox (Mr. J. A. Taylor) discuss it in detail a few days ago. It is an excellent presentation of a very complex issue.

Co-operation between management and labour: The automobile industry can no longer afford the confrontational system of decision-making that characterizes labour-management relations. New techniques of management and new processes of assembly line production have been exported to North America with very low-cost Japanese automobiles.

Now is the time for the industry and organized labour to map out a broad strategic plan cover-

ing the next decade. With their co-operation the province's automobile sector will not only survive the current challenges that it faces but will come out smarter, more efficient and better prepared to meet the changing market preferences of Canada's car market in the 21st century.

In conclusion, I would like to remind members that the Canadian-Japanese trade talks will resume in May. They should join us by letting their federal colleagues know where they stand on this very important issue. They should also send Mr. Lumley a letter supporting some restrictions on foreign imports into Canada.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to be speaking today on the throne speech and after the member for Lakeshore (Mr. Kolyn). I found his talk very interesting, especially as it pertained to the areas of procurement policy, foreign exchange and matters like that. I intend to address those in my remarks today.

First, I would like to speak a little bit about the great constituency of Prescott-Russell, which I have the honour and the pleasure to represent in this Legislature.

Mr. Piché: I hope the member for Prescott-Russell has noticed there are only two members of his party listening to his speech.

Mr. Boudria: As I was saying before I was so rudely interrupted, in March 1981 I was given the honour and privilege to represent the people of the great constituency of Prescott-Russell in this Legislature. It has indeed been a very interesting time. However, our constituency has suffered from very serious economic problems during the past two years and for a number of years before that. Of late, with the downturn in the economy and all the other situations we have had facing us, the life of the people of Prescott-Russell has not been as good as it was before. It is our hope that the economy will pick up and we will finally be able to restore a good economic condition for the people of my constituency.

There are 19 municipalities in the riding of Prescott-Russell, and the riding is roughly 70 miles long and 30 miles wide. It is bordered on two sides by the province of Quebec and on the remainder by other constituencies in Ontario represented by the member for Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry (Mr. Villeneuve) and the member for Carleton East (Mr. MacQuarrie). One small area is bordered by the constituency of Carleton-Grenville as well.

Mr. Piché: How about Cochrane North? Where does that fit in?

Mr. Boudria: The riding of Cochrane North is not too close to my area, but I want the member for Cochrane North (Mr. Piché) to note that we do share many things. The member for Cochrane North was educated only a few miles away from my constituency, I understand, at the Collège Bourget in Rigaud, Quebec, which is just the other side of the Ontario-Quebec border to the east of my riding.

He also has many relatives in my constituency, but they are all Liberals. I am told all Pichés are Liberals as a matter of fact, with the exception of the member for Cochrane North. I suppose there is a black sheep in every family and we will forgive him, because sooner or later he is bound to see the light and see that his party does not represent his views, much less the views of his francophone constituents.

I would like to speak briefly of some of the goings on in the past two years in my constituency. We will all recall there was some dispute as to who was to be the Conservative candidate in Prescott-Russell in the last election. The incumbent member was challenged by another person who felt he was very qualified. He was going to be an instant cabinet minister and all those other things. This individual, whose name is Roland Saumure, ran for the Tory nomination and was defeated, but a fair number of Tories did vote for him.

Since then, he has been very involved in the local Conservative association and in all sorts of other things in my constituency. We will all remember last year he began to make trouble in the community of Bourget and when he did so at that time, of course, the Minister of Education (Miss Stephenson) promptly said to all of us that he, as past chairman of our school board, was responsible for the fact that the school in that area was not in the condition it should have been. So that put an end to that gentleman's political aspirations for a little while.

He came back, however, and wanted to organize a meeting between the local school boards and the member for Ottawa South (Mr. Bennett). The member for Ottawa South organized a little day in our area and it was called, as I remember it, Accountability Day. This, I suggest, means that at other times the local Tory cabinet ministers are not accountable. Anyway, on that particular day, they were accountable, which is always nice to know.

4:40 p.m.

Mr. Saumure organized this meeting in my area between the school board of my riding and the Tory representatives from our area. Here is

the letter he sent to Mr. Saumure. I would like to read a few lines from it.

It says, "Mr. Roland Saumure, Case Postale 68, Bourget, Quebec." We all know that the people of Prescott-Russell and all the people of eastern Ontario, for that matter, have felt for some time that we were treated as though we did not belong in Ontario, but to have the gall to send a letter to one of my constituents—after all, Mr. Saumure is one of my constituents—and to address it Bourget, Quebec. That letter was sent by a Susan Goodman, special assistant to a cabinet minister responsible for eastern Ontario. We can see here the concern this government and this cabinet minister have when they do not even know that my constituency is in this province.

I would like to speak about some of the things we need in Prescott-Russell in order to improve economic conditions. The town of Hawkesbury has been the hardest hit of all areas of my constituency by the present economic downturn. Obviously, there are many things we need in order to re-establish employment in that area.

For a moment I would like to thank very sincerely the effort made by the Minister of Industry and Trade (Mr. Walker). He has been most co-operative in trying to find new industries for Hawkesbury and has greatly assisted me and my constituents. He has not been partisan. He has been very open about sharing information with me and the town council. It is important for me to state that now because he has been very co-operative.

We have not yet found all the solutions; we have found some. Some industries are returning. Of course, for the major industry, the Canadian International Paper plant, we have not yet found a solution, a replacement for that employer. Hopefully that will come if we can continue having that kind of co-operation. Undoubtedly it will assist in that process. I hope and believe the minister will continue co-operating that way, and I want to thank him again.

One of the things Hawkesbury needs in order to regain its place in our province as a good, industrial community is an airport. We have a problem there, for the nearest airport is some 50 miles away, but there is an airport 50 miles away in every direction. There is one to the east, one to the northeast and one to the west, all about 50 miles away. There is difficulty in getting a local airport because of those factors but it is my hope that the Ministry of Transportation and Communications will provide for the needs of Hawkesbury so we can have a proper study

done and get the grants to establish a small municipal airport for that community so that the people in industry could make use of such a facility. The town council has already written to the Ministry of Transportation and Communications to that effect.

On the throne speech, it is important to remember what some journalists have said about its content. I would like to make members aware of the editorial in the *Ottawa Citizen*. I am sure the member for Carleton East (Mr. MacQuarrie) has read it very attentively. I will repeat it in case he has missed a few lines. This was written by Don Butler on April 20.

"Anyone trying to make a case that throne speeches are a pointless ritual need to look no further than this week's Ontario speech from the throne for persuasive evidence.

"For 24 excruciating pages"—pardon my emphasis on the wrong syllable—"the Conservative government bobbed and weaved in an unsuccessful attempt to disguise the fact that it had nothing to say."

"The speech was so devoid of content that Premier William Davis was called upon to explain why it was necessary to inflict it on the populace at all. The best he could muster was that it was traditional to start a session with a throne speech and he is not one to mess around with tradition."

"In place of real information, the throne speech offers platitudes and empty phrases."

That is what we heard from the *Ottawa Citizen*.

I would like to speak about another newspaper in eastern Ontario that is not known to be quite so liberal. This one is called the *Brockville Recorder and Times*. Listen to this from its April 20 edition. It says, and I will recite it only in part:

"The opening of the Third Session of the 32nd Parliament of the province of Ontario was not the stuff of which history is made, but it could have been a splendid opportunity for a government long in office to reflect on its record and to outline its plans.

"Those 24 wordy pages could, for example, have explained the failures in the previous program related to last year's speech. Why had it not been possible, as announced at that time, to provide improved protection for severance pay in the case of failed companies; to strengthen equal pay provisions in law; to create new homemaker services for the independent elderly; to provide capital for young beginning farmers? Did the government change its mind?"

"Provincial issues of absorbing public interest have been the trust companies fiasco; the controversy over doctors' fees; the dilemma of rent control; public sector wage restraint. Why didn't the speech refer to these matters? Does the government not intend to take action with respect to them?"

Those are some of the comments of newspapers in eastern Ontario.

Mr. Conway: They are not very impressed, I take it.

Mr. Boudria: I think it would be fair to say that the people of eastern Ontario are not very impressed with the throne speech.

Mr. Conway: What does the Vankleek Hill Review say?

Mr. Boudria: I have not had the opportunity to look at the editorial page of the Vankleek Hill Review, but I will make the House aware as soon as I find out.

Let us talk about the Board of Industrial Leadership and Development document. It has been referred to as other things in this House. This was supposed to be the blueprint of the government. Well, it has been a blueprint for failure. BILD is simply not endorsed by the private sector and the other levels of government to the degree that had been anticipated.

Let me give members a few examples of how this document has failed. Let us talk a little bit about agriculture. The member for Carleton East (Mr. MacQuarrie) will relate to this, being an eastern Ontario person familiar with agricultural issues and having sat on municipal council.

Mr. Conway: They say he knew more when he was a Liberal.

Mr. Boudria: Oh, I'm sure that's true.

We will all remember, Mr. Speaker—you being from eastern Ontario as well—

Mr. Conway: That is stretching it.

Mr. Boudria: Well, okay. We will all remember that the BILD document stated that one million acres of land in eastern and northern Ontario were going to be tile drained. Wasn't it beautiful to hear that?

Let me tell members how that has worked. Right after the election in which we were promised all of those fine things, the government on two occasions raised the interest on tile drain loans. I know this morning they lowered it once. But at the time when interest was this low—the interest rate was six per cent on tile drain loans; now the government have lowered it to eight, so they are still two percentage points

behind—as well, 75 per cent of the cost of tile drainage projects could formerly be lent by the provincial government; now the amount is only 60 per cent. When they made the new announcement today, they did not choose to raise it to the former figure of 75 per cent.

How is the government ever going to achieve the draining of one million acres of land in eastern and northern Ontario unless it improves the drainage? They never will so long as they have that kind of attitude.

At the time they were draining other parts of the province, the grants and the loans were favourable. The technology at that time could not accommodate the drainage of eastern Ontario, because the pipes would break up. Now that they have the proper technology we can drain eastern Ontario, but now they have withdrawn the favourable grants and loans that we used to have. That means we will always be behind so long as we have this government and this kind of philosophy towards improving the conditions of eastern and northern Ontario.

I want to talk a little bit about agriculture in eastern Ontario. I have spoken about this in the past, but I think it is important to restate it because it is very important.

4:50 p.m.

The area of farm land is decreasing all across the province at the present time. Of course, we all know that. It has decreased from 1971 to 1981 by some 6.5 per cent. However, at the same time that has happened, Russell county which I represent has had a decrease in productive farm land of 13.9 per cent, and Prescott county by 11.5 per cent. The government can see its programs for improving agriculture in eastern and northern Ontario are just not working.

Let us talk a little about the number of farms by county. Across the province, the number of farms has been reduced by some 12.9 per cent over the last 10 years. In eastern Ontario, there has been a decrease of 16.2 per cent. Again, we see eastern Ontario is faring worse than other areas of the province and this government is not acting.

Let us talk a bit about the provincial agriculture budget. Agriculture is an important issue in my riding, especially when the farmers of my area are not doing so well. We must remember that right on the other side of the Ontario-Quebec border there is a different situation in so far as encouraging farmers is concerned. We all recognize that all is not well in Quebec, but maybe enough is said of that. Let us concentrate

on what is offered to agriculture in the two provinces.

The expenditure per farmer in this province is \$3,057 per year; the expenditure per farmer in Quebec is \$9,170. When the products go to market they get exactly the same price. How are the farmers from my area supposed to compete? They cannot because the economic conditions and the opportunities afforded by this government make it such they will never be able to compete.

Let us talk a bit about young farmers. We have had a recycled expression in this Legislature which is so old now, it is starting to grow grey hair. Last year's throne speech had a program for young farmers and last year's budget had a program for young farmers, but the program has never existed. One would think we would already have two programs for young farmers, but no, we still have none.

Guess what this year's throne speech had in it? It had a program for young farmers. Can the members believe it? But again we have no program for young farmers. Guess what? On May 10, I bet we are going to have a program for young farmers announced in the budget. That is going to be great. That will be four announcements for one program which still does not exist. The government has to do better than that. Never mind the rhetoric, just help out the young farmers in my area.

Mr. Andrewes: Beginning farmers.

Mr. Boudria: They are beginning. They have been beginning for 40 years. If this is the beginning, it is time it came to its end.

Mr. Andrewes: Beginning farmers; you missed the point.

Mr. Boudria: I want to talk about housing problems. The Ontario home renewal program has been fairly successful in my part of the province. It is one of the few programs this government has ever implemented that actually worked. In my constituency, municipalities have received considerable benefit from this program. I will name one or two examples, but will not read them all.

For instance, the town of Rockland has received \$344,000 since the inception of this program. The money was recycled and brought in to help out the less fortunate people of that town.

Other municipalities have had considerable benefits as well. For Hawkesbury, \$515,000 has been lent through the OHRP program. This year, when Hawkesbury is suffering the worst

economic situation it has probably ever had, guess what the government did through the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Mr. Bennett), the same guy who came to be accountable to the people of my area the other day? He cancelled the program. Can the members believe it? He cancelled the program during the worst hardship the population of my constituency has had.

I call upon this government to reinstitute the Ontario home renewal program or something like it because we need something to assist people to keep their homes in my area.

I want to talk a bit about another issue which has been a thorn in the side of many people. It is unfortunate the member for Algoma (Mr. Wildman) is not here because he has raised it on several occasions as well. It is the whole issue of how this government treats residents of mobile homes.

The treatment that has been inflicted on those people by the neglect of the government is almost beyond description. This government has chosen to ignore even the existence of all the residents of mobile homes of this province. The only thing I have ever seen them do is publish this three- or four-page information kit that is filled with almost useless information. It should be telling them instead, "Warning: this government does not wish to help out anyone who chooses to reside in a mobile home park."

I tried to introduce a bill in this Legislature to assist residents of mobile home parks last year, a private member's bill, and the government chose one of its members to speak against my bill. Guess which member they chose: the member for Lakeshore. How many mobile homes, Mr. Speaker, do you think there are in Lakeshore? Maybe the member for Lakeshore does not even remember speaking on the bill. The document was just handed to him, and it was said, "Here, member for Lakeshore, read this in the House this afternoon." Has he ever seen a mobile home? Oh yes, he visited his aunt when he was a kid, she used to live in a mobile home. That is probably the only time the honourable member even got close to a mobile home.

I represent thousands of people who live in mobile homes. I have been in them many times. I have assisted the people of the Bellevue mobile home park in Orleans, when the former Tory candidate in the 1977 election in the riding of Ottawa Centre cut their water off last year. That was the government's candidate in the 1977 election, Mr. Brian Cameron. We will read up

on his name for the 1977 election and see what he did to those people and how they suffered, weekends without water, Christmas Day without water, New Year's Day, because he could not get the rent increase that he wanted from the rent review commission.

That is what he did, and that is a former Tory candidate. Another Tory, a member, of course, blocked my bill to try to protect those people in my riding. Shame on them.

One of the things that has not been addressed very seriously by the government is assistance to small business. This government should really increase its commitment towards assisting the small business sector in this province. As we know, a great percentage of the employment is created by the small business area and it is fine to help out the large companies when they are in a difficult situation, the Chryslers and so forth of this world, but we have to remember that small business is what it is all about.

Undoubtedly some of us have come from small towns in Ontario and rural areas. We know what is going on, we know what it is to drive through one of our small villages and see that half of the stores are boarded up and shut down and the people are now purchasing in larger cities. Our small businesses are just disappearing and it is high time that all of us started to realize the importance of that sector and what it has contributed to our society in the past and what it could contribute to in the future if we all gave it assistance.

Mr. Stokes: The province of opportunity.

Mr. Boudria: The member for Lake Nipigon says it well: the province of opportunity. It used to be written on our licence plates, but they do not write it on the licence plates any more, and it is small wonder, because the opportunity is gone under the leadership of the government that we have here.

Mr. Kolyn: Where would you rather be?

Mr. Boudria: In a Liberal Ontario, that is where I would rather be.

Mr. Treleaven: That is a fantasy land.

Mr. Boudria: Time will tell.

I would like to speak briefly about our youth in this province, the most precious resource that we all have. After our youth nothing else is important. The future exists only because of them, but it sure does not look that way when we look at the situation they have right now. It is very serious, and I want all members to pay very close attention to this. There are 233,000 young people in this province who do not have jobs.

I started working some years ago, and I did not have a very good job when I started, I acknowledge that, but at least I had a job. I am sure that all honourable members of this Legislature, when we tried to, had a job. How many young people today are afforded that same opportunity?

5 p.m.

Many people come to see me here in my office at Queen's Park, people from downtown Toronto and many other areas. They cannot find a job. They are people who are well educated and highly qualified. They are people who could be making large salaries and a decent living. They cannot find jobs. It is especially serious for our young people when one out of every four under the age of 25 is not working. It is not only a shame, as the member for Renfrew North (Mr. Conway) said: it is a disaster. I think this government has abandoned its youth.

I would like to speak briefly on environmental issues. One environmental issue in my constituency that is very controversial at this time is the toxic dump site that was to have been established in the municipality of South Plantagenet. Now we hear the dump site will not be located there. I, of course, am rejoicing at that thought, simply because toxic waste is not produced in eastern Ontario.

I know you are probably thinking this is another one of the "not in my backyard" type of situations, Mr. Speaker, but I assure you that is not the case.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Robinson): I appreciate that you thought I was thinking at all.

Mr. Boudria: If the government wants to bring us the jobs that create that toxic waste, we will gladly accept our share of it. But so long as we do not have the economic benefits I fail to see why Prescott-Russell has to accept the burden. The people of our area do not intend to, and I am glad to see the government has finally changed its mind and seemingly will place that dump someplace else in Ontario where at least they get the benefit from it.

Maybe we should speak for a moment on government waste, which is a topic all members are familiar with because it has been raised on some occasions in the past.

We should talk a bit about the fact that this government has spent very large amounts of money on advertising to tell us such great things as "Good Things Grow in Ontario," with strawberries on large bulletin boards in the middle of February, which just happened to be

prior to the last election. It is a mere coincidence, I am sure. Of course, it said at the bottom, "Honourable Lorne Henderson, Minister."

It was just to remind us that all these good strawberries are grown in February in Ontario because we have a Tory government. I think we will need a lot more than a Tory government to make strawberries grow here in February.

Mr. Barlow: Every speech the member gives he says the same thing.

The Acting Speaker: Order.

Mr. Andrewes: What about the other things we grow in Ontario? Do we not have any beef producers?

The Acting Speaker: Order.

Mr. Boudria: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for keeping the honourable members on the other side in line. I am glad to see you are doing that.

Maybe we should talk a little bit about Minaki Lodge. We have heard about it on several occasions.

Mr. Ruston: All \$50 million worth.

Mr. Andrewes: On opening day the member will be there will bells on.

Mr. Boudria: Let us recall that the original Minaki Lodge was acquired by the government in trying to protect its \$550,000 loan. The government loan was \$550,000, the party defaulted and then the government seized the property.

Then it spent \$4.8 million in 1974 to 1976. Then it had a restraint program and it could not do that again because that was too much money being spent. A short while later it decided it was going to revive Minaki, after spending \$4.8 million to save a \$550,000 facility. In so doing, it spent \$28.4 million renovating the lodge. Remember, this is a \$550,000 lodge it was renovating.

There was \$15.9 million spent on the road leading to Minaki. After all, the government could not have a \$28.4-million renovation without having a \$15.9-million road leading to it. That would be totally illogical. So the government has done all this. Of course, it also spent \$850,000 improving an airstrip nearby so one could land to go inside the \$45-million lodge.

5:10 p.m.

All in all, it spent \$45 million on the facility. Do the members know who that is going to serve? It is going to serve the rich and only the rich. The member's constituents will never use it, and he knows it.

Mr. Piché: Why are you against Minaki? Is it because it is in northern Ontario?

Mr. Boudria: As I was saying, it is going to cost \$135 a day to live in Minaki Lodge. I would like to know how many constituents from Cochrane North have \$135 a day to live in that kind of a wasteful facility.

Mr. Piché: What about the millions being spent in the south? Any time there is something in the north this is what we hear from the opposition.

Mr. Boudria: Something in the north? I am sure the people of the north would have preferred jobs.

The Acting Speaker: I would ask the member for Cochrane North to please respect the time of the member for Prescott-Russell who has the floor.

Mr. Piché: He is not respecting any of us in the north when he talks against Minaki.

The Acting Speaker: I would ask the member for Prescott-Russell to try to be not quite so provocative.

Mr. Boudria: I will try not to be provocative, but the member for Cochrane North should know that his constituents do not want that kind of wasteful expenditure any more than we do.

Let us talk about the land assembly deal that the government has got into. They spent \$508 million buying land all across the province because a former Treasurer had a dream. He called it a vision.

Mr. Ruston: Yes.

Mr. Boudria: Yes, the member for Essex North tells me it was a vision that the Treasurer of the time had; a \$508-million vision.

Some of that land was bought in my area; \$13.8 million worth was bought in an area known as Carlsbad Springs, just on the edge of my riding. As the member for Carleton East (Mr. MacQuarrie), who has now left the chamber, would know, because he too represents a part of Carlsbad Springs, one can hardly walk in the fields of Carlsbad Springs without sinking, let alone try to build any kind of housing structure in that area:

As we know, there are cartoons displayed downstairs. One of those cartoons is of the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Mr. Bennett) driving a horse and buggy and it says, "Carlsbad Springs." With his horse and buggy he is sinking right up to the neck in the area. It really explains the folly of the government in buying land for such a venture. I guess that cartoon came from the Ottawa Citizen, but it really described the situation quite well.

Mr. Conway: Claude said some of those land purchases were "evidence that the ministry was off its nut."

Mr. Boudria: Yes, I heard that as well. The member for Ottawa South (Mr. Bennett) did describe it that way.

Maybe we could speak a bit about social issues. I do not want to take too much time doing that because I will have the opportunity of doing so when we start the estimates process. But we have to state a few things. First, the record of this government as it pertains to women's issues, and the record is not very good.

M. le Président, je crois qu'il serait important maintenant de parler de la pauvreté dans la province de l'Ontario, et plus spécialement de la pauvreté chez les femmes. J'ai devant moi l'éditorial du quotidien d'Ottawa, *Le Droit*, du jeudi 10 février 1983, qui s'intitule "La pauvreté a le visage d'une femme." Je n'ai pas l'intention d'en citer de longs extraits, mais je voudrais dire qu'il présente une situation intolérable: celle des femmes dont le salaire moyen n'est qu'un peu supérieur à 50 pour cent de celui d'un homme.

Cette situation est tout à fait inacceptable. Je suis moi-même père de famille. J'ai une fille, petite encore, mais qui deviendra grande. Je refuse — et refuserai toujours — d'accepter le fait que ma fille vaut 50 pour cent du fils d'un autre. Cette situation est vraiment intolérable que ce gouvernement se doit de rectifier, afin d'assurer l'égalité des femmes et des hommes dans cette province.

Le gouvernement a annoncé dans le discours du trône qu'il y aura dorénavant un ministre responsable de la condition féminine. J'espère que cela va réussir, car nous avons déjà eu un ministre dont les fonctions étaient un peu semblables, mais qui n'a absolument rien fait.

It is important to state that the government's record on women's issues is not all that great. For a number of years we have had a minister who was supposed to be responsible for the status of women, and look where it got us. The average salary of a woman is a little bit more than 50 per cent of the average salary of a man.

5:10 p.m.

There was a report stating that one out of every 10 women is a battered wife. You for one will recall, Mr. Speaker, having been a member who sat on that committee, that not much has been done since our report was prepared to improve that situation. I know the Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Drea) said

he would have an answer and a reply to our report on or before the end of April.

Mr. Kolyin: It is the 28th.

Mr. Boudria: This is April 28. That leaves him only a couple of days in which to reply to that report.

I certainly hope the government takes seriously the very constructive report we made in order to improve that area of women's issues, which can be addressed right away because the report has been done. The work has been done by the social development committee of this Legislature.

Another area of social issues we should be concerned with—and there are several, of course—is the whole area of the visually impaired. I have brought this situation to the attention of the Legislature in the past. Some 14,000 people in this province are legally blind, but about 80 per cent of them still have some sight left. As a society, we have not concentrated on helping those people to see. Instead, we have spent our resources on getting them used to the fact that they are blind.

The whole focus of that issue is totally wrong. Most of them can be helped. I really think the Minister of Health (Mr. Grossman), the Minister of Community and Social Services and their boss the Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Mrs. Birch) could do something to improve that situation.

The Minister of Community and Social Services was the subject of an article called, "An Informative Interview with the Honourable Frank Drea, MPP for Scarborough Centre," in his constituency mailout. I guess that constituency is not far from yours, Mr. Speaker, so perhaps you have had the benefit of seeing this questionnaire.

In it, someone was interviewing the minister, who was asked the following, "Compared to other provinces, are you generally satisfied with the level of social services in Ontario?" The minister replied: "I suppose the current annual expense of our provincial budget for community and social services, in the amount of \$2 billion, is a pretty good indicator of Ontario's leadership in the field. Most importantly, the quality of our services is second to none in any other country."

Maybe the minister is satisfied with what is being done in the area of social services in this province, but I for one am not. When a recipient of general welfare assistance in this province has to live on \$230 a month, plus a housing

supplement if he or she qualifies, that is totally unsatisfactory.

I am very disappointed in the minister making that kind of statement, that he was satisfied with the present situation. It is the only thing he could have said as he has not yet convinced the cabinet to give more money, but at least he could have indicated to us that he is personally concerned. He has not even chosen to do that.

We could speak briefly on the francophone issue. We all remember that recently the provincial government issued a white paper entitled, *A Proposal in Response to the Report of the Joint Committee on the Governance of French-Language Elementary and Secondary Schools*. I am sure all honourable members will recall that this report was released a few weeks ago, only a few days before the throne speech, which refers to the issue again.

When we started to discuss the throne speech in this House, the mover of the response for the government was the member for Sarnia (Mr. Brandt) and the seconder was the member for Parry Sound (Mr. Eves). The member for Parry Sound represents a town known as Mattawa. We all know the very serious school conflict that has occurred in that community and how important the issue of francophone education is in Mattawa.

Not one word in the response from the member for Parry Sound was directed towards francophone education, not even after I and other members of this Legislature reminded him of that issue and urged him to speak about it in his reply to the address of His Honour. He never chose to say a word.

That is very unfortunate and it goes to explain—how should I say it? I guess we cannot accuse any member of being hypocritical—I think it indicates the hypocrisy of the government in this area. Let me give an example of how different members have conflicting views that they voice privately to their own constituents on the issue of francophone education.

Members know, of course, the government prides itself in my constituency in telling everyone what a fantastic job it does in providing francophone services. Let us see what some members of the government say.

Members will recall the 1979 by-election in the riding of Carleton, a time when the government published a little flyer in the riding stating: "If you don't want bilingualism à la Trudeau," or something like that, "vote for us." That was the same Tory government. But perhaps we should

not go back that far in history, because maybe they are more enlightened since that time.

Here we have a copy of a newspaper from the constituency of Hastings-Peterborough. In an interview, the member for Hastings-Peterborough (Mr. Pollock) says the following when they start discussing francophone services:

"However, there is one program not easily acceptable to Pollock," that, of course, is the member for Hastings-Peterborough, "a white paper on the province's French-on-demand plan that would permit francophones to request education in their mother tongue." Those are comments made by the member for Hastings-Peterborough to that newspaper from his own constituency.

It does not exactly say the same thing as the Minister of Education (Miss Stephenson) says or what some other honourable ministers from that government say. We can see the concept of this government most of the time, practically all of the time, telling francophones they are giving them everything and telling the anglophones they are giving nothing to the French.

The amount of work and energy spent in doing that, had it been put towards productive areas of this province instead of trying to hide one side from the other, would have been far better spent. The whole issue of francophone education is not solved merely by the fact that this response has come up. First, we are not sure whether the government will ever implement it.

Mr. Bradley: It was not announced during the Carleton by-election.

Mr. Boudria: No, it was not announced during the Carleton by-election. That is a very interesting point. I am sure it is a mere coincidence that it was announced at approximately the same time as the Premier (Mr. Davis) was toying with the idea of running federally and trying to get Quebec delegates' support.

However, some people have dared to question whether the Premier was trying to get Quebec delegates' support by releasing that report. Is that not something? I am sure it has crossed the minds of a few of us upon occasion.

Last year I did a study on the whole issue of francophone education in northern Ontario and released the report that is here. This is entitled, *A Right or a Privilege: The Federal Inquiry into Francophone Minority Education in Ontario*.

I suggest the response to the white paper released by the government does not even address some of the issues or problems that will exist in the area of francophone education, especially as it refers to the powers of the

Languages of Instruction Commission of Ontario. I think the government must address itself to the powers of that commission, otherwise there will always be conflicts.

Let us remember that the statement of October 5, 1979, by the Minister of Education made it quite clear the government wanted to provide better education for francophones, but it never established the proper structure to do it.

5:20 p.m.

In other areas that concern the francophone population, I want to speak very briefly to the issue of health care services for our French-speaking population.

Les services de santé offerts aux francophones de l'Ontario sont tout à fait inadéquats, M. le Président. Il est important de souligner, par exemple, qu'il n'y a pas même, à l'hal de Hawkesbury, un psychiatre à temps plein capable de communiquer en français avec les francophones de la région. Nous n'avons qu'un psychiatre à temps partiel. C'est donc une grave pénurie.

J'ai parlé l'an dernier de cette situation à l'honorable ministre de la Santé. En réponse à une question que je lui avais posée, il m'a dit ne faire aucun effort pour mettre des annonces dans les journaux des autres provinces, par exemple au Québec, pour recruter médecins et cadres des services de santé pouvant servir la population francophone de l'Ontario.

Je me demande si le gouvernement prend vraiment au sérieux le fait d'offrir des services de santé en français aux francophones. Pourquoi n'est-il pas possible de mettre des annonces dans les journaux de Montréal ou ailleurs au Québec, indiquant le besoin de médecins francophones dans Prescott-Russell, dans le Nord ou dans d'autres régions et expliquant les avantages fiscaux et autres que trouverait un médecin québécois à venir s'installer dans notre région? Mais non, le gouvernement n'a jamais rien fait.

Quelques essais timides ont été tentés pour encourager les jeunes à intégrer le système universitaire dans les services de la santé. Mais c'est tout. Alors je pense que si l'on veut offrir un meilleur service, on se doit de faire une campagne sérieuse ailleurs, pour recruter des cadres dans le domaine de la santé.

I would like to talk a little bit about consumer protection. We all recall the trust company incident of some months ago, and again the issues are being raised in this Legislature right now in the whole area of consumer and commercial relations.

One area the government should address

itself to is the protection of consumers buying automobiles. It is interesting that the subject of automobiles was brought up earlier on. This government should have the kind of legislation that exists, for instance, in Connecticut and California—in effect, a lemon bill, as it is referred to in those jurisdictions. I intend, shortly, to introduce a private member's bill, a bill that would be entitled that way, a lemon act, to protect consumers in this province against purchasing new automobiles that may be so defective as to be inoperative, that are just no good. I believe a government should take legislative measures to ensure the consumers are given their money back when such a thing happens.

The Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Elgie), when he became quite unpopular last year after the trust company controversy, decided to do something to be the saviour of the world. What he chose to do, of course, was to ban kickboxing. What banning kickboxing has to do with increasing the minister's popularity, I still have not quite figured out.

However, the minister came into this House one day and made an announcement that from then on kickboxing was going to be banned. Is that not interesting? He said it was a very dangerous sport. We asked him if anybody had ever been hurt. He said: "Well, I don't know. Probably not." We asked if anybody had ever been hospitalized overnight for an accident involving kickboxing. He said: "No. We have no such record." We asked if there were any complaints about the sport. He said: "No. But I banned it anyway."

If the logic of that somewhat escapes you, Mr. Speaker, you are not the only one. He did say the power of a foot was 20 times that of a fist. Imagine. Jean-Yves Theriault, the world champion kickboxer, stated, "If my foot were 20 times the power of my fist, I would kick right through somebody and my foot would come out the other side." That shows just how ridiculous was that kind of statement, made by the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations, which indicated a total lack of understanding of that sport. He only did it to try to take the focus off other issues he was unpopular for.

Very briefly, I would like to talk about 1984, which is the year we will be celebrating the supposed 200th anniversary of this province. I for one do not intend to celebrate 1984. I do not believe it reflects the accuracy of the 200th anniversary of this province. We should celebrate that in 1991. The Constitutional Act was

signed in 1791; and 200 years after 1971, according to my calculator, equals 1991, not 1984. I challenge anybody to rig the mathematics to tell me otherwise. That is blatantly political. All they are doing is using that year as a springboard for their election.

Let me give an example of how they are doing that. I talked about Roland Saumure, the fellow who organizes the connections between the Tory party and people in my area, that fellow who was sent a letter stating, "Bourget, Quebec." Who was chosen to co-ordinate the bicentennial celebrations in my riding? Roland Saumure, the defeated Tory candidate for the nomination. Again a mere coincidence, but this is not a political event.

"We are not trying to bring Her Majesty here for political purposes," says the government. "Absolutely not. We just chose defeated Tory candidates to run this in various ridings as a coincidence." I suppose it is because Mr. Saumure happens to be very qualified in matters pertaining to the bicentennial of the province. I am sure that will not do him much good either.

In concluding, I would be remiss in my duty if I did not take some time to talk about the procurement policy of the government. Members will remember last year, after being provoked by the member for Cambridge (Mr. Barlow), I rose in my place and talked about the fact that this government was not doing too well in its procurement policy. I would like to report progress today.

I have here a pen from the Ministry of Intergovernmental Affairs. This is a Bic pen. This Bic pen, in addition to "Renseignement Ontario, service en français" and all that—they give them out in my riding, although not too much in Hastings-Peterborough—is marked "Made in USA."

I just came back from the lobby and picked up this tray we use to put dishes on. It says, "Camborough Manufacturing, Huntington Beach, California." Is that not progress? A year later, that is how much we have progressed.

We have another item here made by Camborough in California. Again, here is a cardboard box made in Franklin Park, Illinois. This is a government of Ontario diary that we use. It is made by the Sheaffer Eaton division of Tetrion Inc. and is marked "Printed in USA." We are doing really well. This is a paper product, and trees are very scarce in this country.

Here we have a paper moistener made in

Carlstadt, New Jersey. We are doing very well. Two years later, we are progressing.

Here is something members will be interested in. The Minister of Government Services (Mr. Wiseman) comes from the riding of Lanark. In that riding is a little town called Perth. Perth prides itself in its scissors factory. It produces scissors, just beautiful scissors. There are two pairs here, both government issue. This one is made in Taiwan and this one in England. That is producing a lot of jobs in the constituency of the Minister of Government Services.

Here we have little yellow scratch pads. They come from the Ministry of Government Services catalogue. These are 3M scratch pads from St. Paul, Minnesota.

We have my favourite item here, the Royal Doulton fine hotel ware used in our dining room downstairs. Again, much progress has been made over the last year in its procurement policy. I challenge this government to do something about that policy, to update it, to give a break to Canadian industry.

5:30 p.m.

We heard from the Minister of Industry and Trade (Mr. Walker) last week that nobody makes a stapler in this province. We know that because this government stapler says, "Swingline Inc., Long Island County, New York."

Mr. Conway: The stapler must have come along with the member for St. George (Ms. Fish).

Mr. Boudria: That is possible. Here we have gummed labels, paper labels. These gummed labels, glue government issue, are made by the Dennison Manufacturing Co. in Framingham, Massachusetts, USA. We are doing very well in our buy Canadian policy.

We have a glue stick and it is made in West Germany. Glue is very scarce in Ontario. We have a highlighter pencil. Where is this one made? It is made in the United States. We have here a staple remover made in Hong Kong. We have a letter opener made in Korea. We have a brand-new paper punch made in England. All in all, we have a very good record here in Ontario for our procurement policy.

There is one area of progress. We still use Paper Mate pens with the government of Ontario logo on them, but I am glad to say the government has finally told the supplier, "Please do not write 'Made in USA' on them any more." It is probably the same pen, but at least it does not say "Made in USA" on the government of Ontario pen.

We have achieved enormous progress over the past year. I am glad to say part of the clock we bought for this Legislature was manufactured in Burlington; but the dials, which the member for Sudbury (Mr. Gordon) was complaining about, are made in England. That is the progress we have achieved in this Legislature over the past few years.

I would like to thank the honourable members for their attention, and I again want to stress that this government has not lived up to its promise of 1981. It has not kept the promise. It has done everything but keep the promise.

Mr. Conway: Do they make bow ties in Canada?

Mr. Boudria: Maybe they do. We are going to find out some day whether they make bow ties. I sure hope we begin to do something so we improve the economy of this province. A good, strong Canadian procurement policy by this government can go a long way towards achieving that.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Robinson): I would like to thank the honourable member from the Mel Swart school of show and tell. Does any other honourable member wish to participate?

Mr. Stokes: I think that is very inappropriate.

The Acting Speaker: I withdraw the remark.

Mr. Stokes: I think that is very inappropriate for somebody who is occupying the Speaker's chair, an unseemly remark like that.

The Acting Speaker: I withdrew the remark. Does any other honourable member wish to participate in the debate?

Mr. Van Horne: Mr. Speaker, my reluctance to stand was based on the understanding that the Conservative Party was about to have a speaker rise in his place but, given that is not the case, I will gladly proceed.

Let me begin by reflecting on the comments made by one of our well-known columnists who, a day or two prior to the throne speech being introduced, reflected on this theme:

"Lieutenant Governor John Black Aird would do us all a favour if he opened the Ontario Legislature on Monday with an apology for his government's failure to live up to expectations. It wouldn't be difficult, something like, 'In a moment the throne speech, but first I want to say that I'm really sorry I made some promises last year that my government couldn't keep.' Then he could call the Premier before him and ask him to explain why certain promises were not kept, threatening to throw him into the

federal leadership contest if he had no satisfactory answer."

We all enjoy a little bit of humour from time to time and that, of course, was the intent of the columnist, Mr. French. Beyond that, he was drawing to our attention something that is overlooked from time to time by us in the Legislature and certainly by the people of Ontario, and that is the promises of earlier throne speeches or earlier statements by the government.

To give the members some evidence of that, I want to go back through a few of these comments from the past 10 or 12 years and point out that many of the promises made were not kept.

Here is a statement from March 1971. The government said: "The current unconscionable levels of unemployment which have been forced upon the Canadian people will be combated with every means at the disposal of this provincial government. The budget will be presented on April 26. Its purpose will be to restore the inherent vitality of our economy so far as this is within provincial competence."

In February 1978, the government said: "Relieving the current state of unemployment is, in many respects, beyond the control of a provincial jurisdiction. Ontario believes, therefore, that we must seek national answers to national problems and that we strengthen Canadian responses to larger economic challenge only throughout co-ordinated initiatives." Of course, it went on for the following four or five years to bash the federal government.

Here is another statement from Ontario, going back to 1971: "Summer employment for students will also require increased government assistance. Programs have been created to enable students to demonstrate their personal initiative, respond to their concern about the environment and acquire funds which will permit their education to be continued."

Here is another government statement, from 1972: "My government will continue in the summer months the employment for youth program and will increase the scope of this program by providing additional funds for its activities."

Again from 1971: "My government has also been most concerned to ensure that young people are not disadvantaged in the search for work."

From 1981: "A community counselling program will be developed to tap the resources of our young people and guide them towards worthwhile and productive jobs."

About job training, it said in 1978: "Despite the numbers of unemployed and underemployed, a shortage of skilled tradesmen has been recurring in the manufacturing sector. This paradox can only be resolved by a training program especially geared to satisfy the manpower needs of industry. Development of such a program will be given the highest priority during the year."

I have referred to only four pages of 16 pages of such quotes that I have; and, given the opportunity to speak for two or three hours, I could go on and repeat most of what I have just said in those few comments.

The point is that this particular speech from the throne leaves much to be desired. Our leader put it quite succinctly when he said in reaction to the speech that the Conservative government's response to this province's current economic ills is to await a recovery led by the private sector, increased consumer confidence and events in the United States.

On the basis of this year's speech from the throne, the Conservatives feel no compulsion to take the lead in promoting an economic recovery; nor is there any indication that it is positioning itself to deal with the challenges of the technological changes which are already besetting Ontario's industries.

My leader went on to say: "There is no indication of any new job creation program. In particular, the government has abdicated its responsibilities for the hundreds of thousands of unemployed youth in this province by ignoring any new programs aimed at this most distressing of all our current economic problems."

I am a little confused when I read through this speech to read statements such as we find on the very opening page in which the government indicates that it feels the restoration of confidence has begun, and yet it goes on in the next breath to say that the personal economic outlook for many Ontarians will remain challenging. It then goes on to spell out doom and gloom.

It is difficult too for me, beyond those words, to accept that the restoration process is really under way when I consider problems presented to me day by day in my constituency office.

I have the authority of the writer of this particular letter to use it as a reference point in this debate today. This is a letter from a constituent of mine, Mrs. Judy Foell of Kipp's Lane in London. She gives me some background in this letter, dated March 1983, and followed it up with conversations by phone in the past few days. She indicates:

"Today I have applied for general welfare

assistance. The following is a list of my monthly expenses: rent \$284, food \$140, phone \$12, dry cleaning \$3, cable \$8, household insurance \$7, bills of \$20, \$6.80, \$6.50, etc.; total \$487.30.

"Welfare is going to pay me approximately \$313 per month. Can someone please tell me how I am going to live on \$7.25 a week for food? With this kind of assistance I can understand why so many people steal. After I pay my rent and food I can't afford cable, household insurance, etc. Something has to be done and has to be done soon. And this wonderful government can pay various members of commissions, etc. many hundreds of dollars a day just to find out what is wrong with the economy."

5:40 p.m.

The letter goes on in some detail about the plight in which this particular person finds herself, with no light at the end of the tunnel. As the leader of the third party said the other day, this might better be called, "the light at the end of the gangplank, as opposed to the light at the end of the tunnel."

There is another constituent of mine whose picture appears in today's London Free Press, with somewhat the same problem. I am referring to Mrs. Sharon Stiles whose concern about the economy is one she has to struggle and fight with every day as a single parent, leading a single parent family.

The Ontario Liberal Party has prepared a paper dealing with jobs for youth. We have had a task force headed up by the member for Kitchener-Wilmot (Mr. Sweeney), and in his report there are certain recommendations made. I want to make reference to the recommendations of our youth task force employment report. It is worth reviewing these recommendations and summarizing the progress made towards their implementation.

The first recommendation made in that report was to provide more training opportunities for those who are currently unemployed in order to meet skilled manpower demands, particularly in new technologies when the economy improves. No action has been taken to date.

2. Encourage through incentives and/or require through legislation on-the-job training by Ontario industry with a view to meeting our own skilled workers' needs. There has been no action to date.

3. Restructure the apprenticeship program to permit easier access and reduce the current high drop-out rate. Again, there has been no action from the government.

4. Make a realistic and conservative attempt

to change the public's conception of the value and importance of skilled trades, with a view to removing the stigma still attached to blue collar work. Again, there has been no action.

5. Improve upon the present counsellor-to-student ratio of one to four hundred and improve in-service opportunities for counsellors to keep abreast of changes in business and industry. No action has been taken.

6. Introduce career counselling at the elementary school level. We acknowledge a wee bit of progress in that area.

7. Re-evaluate the present secondary school curriculum and make mandatory such core subjects as English, mathematics and science, to ensure young people are equipped to be flexible and adaptable in today's changing labour market. Implemented, and is that not wonderful?

8. In this connection, particularly stress the importance of female students continuing to study maths and sciences, enabling them to qualify for the new technologies. In that area, some progress has been made.

9. Introduce into schools a mandatory credit course in career guidance, job readiness and development of marketable skills. There has been no action.

10. Strongly support and provide effective ministerial guidelines as well as mandatory standards for co-op education and work experience programs in secondary schools which provide a more realistic bridge from the school to the work environment. There has been no action.

11. Encourage greater liaison between industries, business and education. There has been very limited progress.

12. The last recommendation is to improve manpower forecasting by government and business to assist counsellors and students to make appropriate career decisions. There has been limited progress in this area; notably some progress with the federal government.

Now that is not a very happy record, nor is it a very happy record to consider when one looks back at the promises made by our government in its earlier throne speeches.

Moving on through the throne speech, the next topic that it addresses, on page 3, is the significant slowdown in inflation, and then the trend in wage and salary settlements which are contributing to a growth in confidence in our ability to deal with inflation. There is an indirect reference there to the wage restraint bill that the government brought in last year after the theme of six and five was introduced by the federal

government. There is no reference, no credit given to any federal government initiative in this area.

I think the member for Sudbury East (Mr. Martel), did a commendable job yesterday in dealing with the concerns of his party and, for that matter, members outside of his party in this Legislature, members from our party and, hopefully, from the Conservative Party insofar as occupational health and safety is concerned.

He went on at considerable length about that theme. I think he should be commended. However, when we get into the throne speech and look at the area of labour, the reference to labour is almost conspicuous by its absence. I would point out that the government missed a golden opportunity in its speech to deal with that theme of occupational health and safety and, for that matter, other themes such as severance pay. There is no reference that I can see in here on that particular theme.

Carrying on to another aspect of this throne speech—I am not going to hit on all of them given that there are only 12 minutes left before we recess—I do want to point out again that page 7 of the throne speech says:

"While the recently established federal Royal Commission on the Economic Union and Development Prospects for Canada was a welcome initiative, we cannot rely solely on this longer-term process to spur lasting economic recovery. Enhanced federal-provincial co-operation is required now."

There is no indication of how that enhanced federal-provincial co-operation is going to be fostered, but I would hope that we have reached a point in history, and a point in our Ontario Legislature, where we are going to put this constant fed-bashing theme aside and seriously, and honestly, attempt to work in a co-operative way to see that the economic union and development prospects for Canada does become a fact.

I am interested too, and very curious about the reference made in the latter part of page 7 of the throne speech about strengthening "the management of the province's affairs." What a large, sweeping, half-dozen words that is. What does it mean? How are we going to strengthen the management of the province's affairs? What magic wand is the Premier (Mr. Davis) going to wave, or is the cabinet going to wave, to strengthen the management of the province's affairs?

It may well be that the government is going to reflect on the error of its ways. It may reflect on

such things as some of the thoughts brought here in private members' hour. I want to go back and recall May 1979, a time at which this House considered a private member's bill called "Program Cost Disclosure Act."

This bill was debated on a Thursday afternoon. It was defeated because, I suppose, it was a bill from a member of the opposition. One of the main speakers who spoke against this particular bill—I must admit with a degree of delight it was I who sponsored it—was the member for Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. McCague). He said that we did not need a bill such as the Program Cost Disclosure Act because the government, in a very routine manner, currently assesses all the factors concerning past and new programs that this bill sought to have included in the compendium of information.

5:50 p.m.

Later that same year there was another private member's bill presented and that was the Fiscal Plan Act. The member for Oriole (Mr. Williams) did the hatchet job on that particular bill. The member for Oriole said: "Lest there be any doubt that this cannot be substantiated—and I think this is something that the sponsors clearly and perhaps intentionally overlooked today—the fact is that it is spelled out quite clearly in recent budgets that long-term planning was an integral part of the budgetary process."

Given the government is already doing those things, one wonders how they might improve on it. We look forward to some elaboration on that particular little sentence that was put in on page seven of the throne speech that the Ontario government will bring in measures "to strengthen the management of the province's affairs."

I am curious as to whether they might be going to go back to the Minister of Industry and Trade (Mr. Walker) and revive his sunset theme and a few of the refinements on it and try to bring that back to us in this Legislature.

Moving on, the government says on the next page of its throne speech: "In the coming year, the government will continue to set priorities and co-ordinate economic initiatives to ensure that our province is able to take full advantage of the many resource and technological opportunities that will be available in the future."

The resource opportunities in northern Ontario are there in such abundance we would hope this particular reference would address itself to northern Ontario. But when one considers the north in this throne speech, one has to look through three or four times to find anything

much more significant than the implication there, and the statement in the later paragraph that it will provide "assistance to single-industry communities in northern Ontario."

If the member for Lake Nipigon (Mr. Stokes), who has been here longer than I and who has a much closer connection with the north, had a dollar for every time he has heard a promise such as that he could walk out of here a rather rich man. What we are hoping for and, more importantly, what the people of northern Ontario are hoping for is some substance to these promises. These things could be considered as hollow statements, because we have found in throne speeches, as I referred to in my very opening comment, for the last 10 or 12 years, hollow promises and promises unfulfilled.

I want to move on to the middle part of this particular speech and get into pages 12 and 13 where there is some reference made to the farm community. The member for Huron-Middlesex (Mr. Riddell) has alluded to the statements here that address themselves to the farm community. But the government cannot forget, again the member for Huron-Middlesex made a point of this today, that insofar as agriculture and the farming community is concerned the Liberal Party over the years, even though we have not been the government, has played an extremely viable role. The suggestions made by our critics over the years have, I am sure, immeasurably helped many of the government programs.

I want to commend our member for Huron-Middlesex for the work he has done and remind the government that no matter what it is thinking or planning in the agricultural community, it had better be cognizant of the contribution that can be made by members from the opposition.

Given the time press we have here, I would like to address myself to one or two themes that have been ignored in this throne speech, rather than reviewing in the last few pages other themes such as French language, etc.

When I turned on the radio this morning I was interested to hear the comments made by our Solicitor General (Mr. G. W. Taylor), who expressed some concern and considerable surprise in a radio interview that a video tape he had picked up on the weekend and taken home for his family contained language that was rather abrasive and I assume it contained things other than language that could be visually offensive particularly to young people.

I note with some concern that the government's throne speech does not address itself to anything that could be described in general

terms as a moral issue. I am sorry to say this, because on occasion we have had at least committee discussions—no great discussions in chamber, but at least committee discussions—about such things as the censorship process and the censorship board here in Ontario.

Given the climate and given the concern that a considerable number of people have about such things as video tapes, movies that are available on cable, and pornography, whose availability in our variety stores is expanding, the government is missing a golden opportunity if it does not address itself to what I consider to be a very serious moral issue. They have not done that. They are choosing to ignore and I would submit, to ignore with impunity this real problem that we have in our province.

Beyond that there are other things that have cropped up from time to time in the past year that could have been addressed in this throne speech, but, for whatever reasons, the government has chosen to present a rather brief, rather vague blueprint of its plan for the coming year.

One of our judges suggested, for example, regarding some of the problems that appear in our courts dealing with family breakup, that marriage as a theme could be presented in the school system. There are some people who have disagreed with that editorially and otherwise, and yet there are some who agree with it. The government again has missed the opportunity at least to put the subject on the table for some discussion.

Why would the government shy away from addressing itself to things that are of serious concern to the people of this province? The government, in my view, has a mandate to address itself to something more than putting pavement on roads and dollars into school boards to run their schools. I think it needs to play a greater leadership role in areas such as I have described: the concern over pornography, broken homes, marriage courses, etc.

Another theme that has appeared in the pages of our press and in radio and television reports over the last month or two—and I was surprised that no reference was made to this in the throne speech—is the condition of the jails in Ontario. Take a look through the Ontario Public Service Employees Union press release of February 15, which talks about the explosive situation in provincial jails. Why have we not addressed ourselves to that theme in this throne speech?

Going back to education, the Minister of Education (Miss Stephenson) indicated at one point that she wanted to study the impact of

metric on the school system. Why was no mention made of that?

I could go on with literally hundreds of themes that were missed, but I will conclude my remarks, given the time, by submitting that the throne speech is very shallow. We hope that when we see the budget we will find more evidence of this government's concern about the economy and about the citizens of Ontario.

On motion by Hon. Mr. Wells, the debate was adjourned.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I would like to indicate the business of the House for the remainder of this week and next.

Tonight and tomorrow we will continue with

the throne speech debate. Next Monday afternoon and Tuesday afternoon and evening, May 2 and 3, we will also continue with the throne speech debate. On Wednesday morning the usual three committees may meet. On Thursday, May 5, we will have the windup of the throne speech debate in the afternoon with the vote at 5:45 p.m. and the time will be divided amongst the three windup speakers.

Next Thursday evening we will deal with the following legislation: Committee of the whole on Bill 7, the Toronto Futures Exchange Act, and then second reading of Bills 3, 4, 5, 13 and 2. Consideration of that legislation will continue on the morning of Friday, May 6.

The House recessed at 6 p.m.

CONTENTS

Thursday, April 28, 1983

Statements by the ministry

Drea, Hon. F., Minister of Community and Social Services:	
Developmentally handicapped people.	249
Elgie, Hon. R. G., Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations:	
Norcen Energy Resources Ltd..	252
Grossman, Hon. L. S., Minister of Health:	
Deaths at Hospital for Sick Children.	247
Henderson, Hon. L. C., Provincial Secretary for Resources Development:	
Highway construction program.	254
McCaffrey, Hon. B., Minister of Citizenship and Culture:	
Government and the arts.	253
Norton, Hon. K. C., Minister of the Environment:	
Acid rain.	249
Taylor, Hon. G. W., Solicitor General:	
Deaths at Hospital for Sick Children.	246

Oral questions

Birch, Hon. M., Provincial Secretary for Social Development:	
Education legislation, Mr. Bradley, Mr. Grande.	261
Drea, Hon. F., Minister of Community and Social Services:	
Education for developmentally handicapped, Mr. Haggerty, Mr. Bradley.	265
Elgie, Hon. R. G., Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations:	
Norcen Energy Resources Ltd., Mr. Peterson, Mr. Renwick.	256
Gasoline prices, Mr. Stokes.	261
Norcen Energy Resources Ltd., Mr. Renwick, Mr. Roy, Mr. Peterson.	263
Grossman, Hon. L. S., Minister of Health:	
Security at Hospital for Sick Children, Mr. Rae, Ms. Copps.	258
Norton, Hon. K. C., Minister of the Environment:	
Sudbury environmental study, Mr. Elston, Mr. Laughren.	262
Taylor, Hon. G. W., Solicitor General:	
Deaths at Hospital for Sick Children, Mr. Peterson, Mr. Rae, Ms. Copps.	255
Walker, Hon. G. W., Minister of Industry and Trade:	
Closure of Consolidated-Bathurst plant, Mr. Rae, Ms. Copps, Mr. Mackenzie.	259

Petition

Gas prices, Mr. Kerrio, tabled.	267
--	-----

Motion

City of Toronto bill , Mr. Gregory, agreed to.	268
---	-----

First readings

Ministry of Government Services Amendment Act , Bill 23, Mr. Wiseman, agreed to.	268
Education Amendment Act , Bill 24, Mr. Cooke, agreed to.	268

Throne speech debate

Mr. Kolyn	268
Mr. Boudria	271
Mr. Van Horne	281

Other business

Young Ontarians , Mr. Van Horne.	245
Death of Harry Bray , Mr. Elgie, Mr. Renwick, Mr. Drea.	245
Flood plain mapping , Mr. Swart.	246
Outlook agricultural conference , Mr. Riddell.	246
Digital clock in chamber , Mr. Speaker, Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Cunningham.	246
Premier's horoscope , Mr. Peterson.	246
Visitors , Mr. Norton.	249
Digital clock in chamber , Mr. Gordon, Mr. Bradley, Mr. Cassidy.	266
Trust companies , Mr. Elgie.	267
Business of the House , Mr. Wells.	286
Recess	286

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Andrewes, P. W. (Lincoln PC)
Barlow, W. W. (Cambridge PC)
Boudria, D. (Prescott-Russell L)
Bradley, J. J. (St. Catharines L)
Cassidy, M. (Ottawa Centre NDP)
Conway, S. G. (Renfrew North L)
Cooke, D. S. (Windsor-Riverside NDP)
Copps, S. M. (Hamilton Centre L)
Cunningham, E. G. (Wentworth North L)
Davis, Hon. W. G., Premier (Brampton PC)
Drea, Hon. F., Minister of Community and Social Services (Scarborough Centre PC)
Eakins, J. F. (Victoria-Haliburton L)
Elgie, Hon. R. G., Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (York East PC)
Elston, M. J. (Huron-Bruce L)
Gordon, J. K. (Sudbury PC)
Gregory, Hon. M. E. C., Minister without Portfolio (Mississauga East PC)
Grossman, Hon. L. S., Minister of Health (St. Andrew-St. Patrick PC)
Haggerty, R. (Erie L)
Henderson, Hon. L. C., Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Lambton PC)
Johnston, R. F. (Scarborough West NDP)
Kerrio, V. G. (Niagara Falls L)
Kolyn, A. (Lakeshore PC)
Laughren, F. (Nickel Belt NDP)
Mackenzie, R. W. (Hamilton East NDP)
McCaffrey, Hon. R. B., Minister of Citizenship and Culture (Armourdale PC)
McMurtry, Hon. R. R., Attorney General (Eglinton PC)
Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
Norton, Hon. K. C., Minister of the Environment (Kingston and the Islands PC)
Peterson, D. R. (London Centre L)
Piché, R. L. (Cochrane North PC)
Rae, R. K. (York South NDP)
Renwick, J. A. (Riverdale NDP)
Riddell, J. K. (Huron-Middlesex L)
Robinson, A. M. (Scarborough-Ellesmere PC)
Roy, A. J. (Ottawa East L)
Sargent, E. C. (Grey-Bruce L)
Stokes, J. E. (Lake Nipigon NDP)
Swart, M. L. (Welland-Thorold NDP)
Sweeney, J. (Kitchener-Wilmot L)
Taylor, Hon. G. W., Solicitor General (Simcoe Centre PC)
Turner, Hon. J. M., Speaker (Peterborough PC)
Van Horne, R. G. (London North L)
Walker, Hon. G. W., Minister of Industry and Trade (London South PC)
Wells, Hon. T. L., Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Scarborough North PC)



Hansard

Official Report of Debates

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Third Session, 32nd Parliament

Thursday, April 28, 1983

Evening Sitting

Speaker: Honourable John M. Turner

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

Contents of the proceedings reported in this issue of Hansard appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of the speakers taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is \$15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, Information Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 965-2238.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Thursday, April 28, 1983

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE (continued)

Resuming the debate on the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take part in the throne speech debate tonight because I think this session and this speech from the throne will be looked upon historically as a very important event. We are now in a period when we are witnessing a turnaround in events. A restoration of confidence in the economy and in the life of this country has begun.

After a period of time historians will probably say was the worst, or at least equal to that experienced by this country in the 1930s, I think we are now on the verge of a recovery period.

As the speech from the throne said, and as I would say on every occasion, the restoration of confidence has begun. People are beginning to feel things are starting to happen. The positive signs are out there and those positive signs were indicated in the speech from the throne at this third session of this Legislature and Parliament.

What are those positive signs? They are signs such as the fact that we are now in a period when the consumer price index has declined in a year from somewhere around 12 per cent to between six and seven per cent. Inflation is being brought under control.

We are seeing a decrease in interest rates and because of this we are seeing greatly increased activity in the housing market. Houses are beginning to sell. Houses are beginning to be built.

I am always amazed when I hear people talk about there not being any houses built, that there are no housing starts going on. Then I look around my riding of Scarborough North and all I see are sewers being laid, roads being built, houses going up and condominiums and apartments being built in a whole variety of price ranges; and that activity has accelerated in the last three or four months because interest rates are lower, people are now buying and confi-

dence is beginning to be felt again in this province, in this country and in our economy.

There is no question that unemployment is still too high; we all accept that. This speech from the throne accepts the fact that the emphasis today as we enter this period of confidence must be on the creation of jobs. As I read the federal budget presented by Mr. Lalonde, this is what he emphasizes: that this country must create jobs, that we must help the unemployed; and the measures that will do that are there. I think that will be the kind of direction our budget will take when the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) presents it on May 10.

Mr. Stokes: Watch those leaks now.

Hon. Mr. Wells: No, I am not going to say any more about the budget, of course; the budget will speak for itself. As the speech from the throne said, one of the major thrusts because of this period we are in now will be the budget, but coupled with the budget will be the initiatives this government takes in a number of other areas, and one of the areas I am most impressed with is that of the creation of increased markets in international trade.

The initiatives being taken by the Ministry of Industry and Trade today are exemplary. They have set for themselves, for this province and on behalf of this government as policy of this government, goals to stimulate business investment over the next two years, to double our foreign trade over the next five years, to increase the domestic market so it will expand and to increase the productivity and entrepreneurship of small and medium-sized businesses so they can build in this province and add to the economic growth and life of this province. These kinds of initiatives are the things that are going to be necessary to bring about the stimulation that will create jobs in this province.

I have always been impressed when people want to talk about what is the philosophy and role of a government such as ours in this province. We have debated many times various actions of this government. Our friends across the way have been critical of our involvement in Suncor, they have been critical of the things we have done in relation to trust companies and

they have been critical of some other initiatives we have taken from time to time.

But like my friend the member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick) and others in this House, I am one who believes that we have to learn from history, and in order to chart the course we want to go in the future we also look at what has happened in the past. Usually the historic routes of a political party and the history of its actions provide a pretty good guideline for the kind of actions one should take in the future.

In this regard I was very interested to read in the *Toronto Star* on the weekend an article by Peter Oliver, who is a history professor at York University. I want to quote a couple of paragraphs from this article because—

Mr. Stokes: Is that the one on the interventionist Tories?

Hon. Mr. Wells: That is right. I do not know whether everyone believes this article, but for me this represents the kind of policy that has built this province and it also represents the kind of policy that has allowed a Progressive Conservative government to be the government of this province for 64 years in this century.

Mr. Kerrio: Your record is nearly as good as Franco's in Spain.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Think of that. For 64 of the 82 years of this century the people of this province have put their faith in Conservative government, and if you read back in—

Mr. Ruston: They were not all Conservative.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Oh yes, that is where my friend is wrong. They are really Conservative governments. If one reads some of the writings of Disraeli, one will find that a Conservative government preserves the good that is in the past and takes those good new ideas that are needed and brings those into play too.

8:10 p.m.

A Conservative government believes that the initiative of the individual and the initiative of the private market sector can bring about real economic growth in a country and in a province, but it also believes that where government initiative and support is needed, government initiative and support should be available. That is the kind of philosophy we have always believed in.

I was just reading on the weekend some of the battles of Sir James Whitney when he won the election in 1905. When he won that election, he promised that one of the main platforms would be to create the Hydroelectric Power Commis-

sion of Ontario so that Ontario could have cheap power, because he knew that would be the way this province could grow and develop. Sir James Whitney faced the united attack of a lot of big businessmen and he wrapped himself in the Union Jack and he rode right over their heads to the people of urban Ontario. He won the elections and he laid the groundwork for this party's future successes in this province.

I am certainly not an expert on Hydro, as the former member for York South, Mr. MacDonald, and others in this House are, but when one thinks of what Sir James Whitney and Sir Adam Beck did in creating Hydro, and when one looks at the history of Hydro throughout the 84 years in this province, I think it shows a bit why this government has been able to remain the government and others have not, because some of the big issues and big political divisions occurred around Hydro. The first one was when the interests tried to stop Sir Adam Beck and Sir James Whitney in the development of Ontario Hydro.

Then we come up to the years of the 1930s and the early 1940s, when Mitchell Hepburn said, "Oh, we don't need any more power in this province." He cut off contracts and interfered with things concerning Hydro, and George Drew was re-elected to get those Hydro contracts going again and to get power into this province. Then he won an election on the conversion from 25 to 60 cycles. The affairs of Hydro have been woven through the political life of this province and this government has always believed we should be forward-sighted, we should know cheap power is the one thing that can build the economic life of this province and can also guarantee the quality of life for the people of this province.

Perhaps we are seeing a rerun of that again. We are in the position today where Ontario Hydro at the present time is being criticized because it had the foresight to realize that (a) this province had to have at least some nuclear power development, and (b) it had to have lots of power, so that when the growth period begins power will be here and we will have our own energy source. We do not have oil, we do not have natural gas, as do other provinces, but we have a great natural resource in the kind of electric power that can be produced in this province.

It may be that historians will look back and say we are again at another watershed when those opposite continually want to attack Hydro. They want to attack the fact that we have

nuclear power in this province, they want to attack the men who were not completely infallible but who looked ahead and said we had to prepare for the future and we had to have lots of power in this province.

We may have overbuilt a little, but I would rather be a little overbuilt than have to go back to those periods after Mitchell Hepburn when I never knew whether the lights were going to stay on in my house or not.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I am sure you are all going to get a chance to make your views known at the appropriate time.

Mr. Stokes: No, we are not. It is over next Thursday.

Mr. Speaker: If I may make an observation, you are sure making up for it now. Having said that, the member for Scarborough North has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I just again recalled one of the statements my friend and former chairman of Hydro Hugh Macaulay made when people talked about the installation of scrubbers at various coal-fired plants, something which Hydro is moving ahead with and which takes a lot of time and costs a lot of money. He always said, "You know, the best scrubbers we have got in this province are our nuclear power plants."

I think there is some concern about nuclear power development in this province; sure there is. We have to be concerned about accidents and about where the nuclear waste can be put. If there is anyone in this House who is concerned and worried about where nuclear waste can be put it is myself. I still have some soil in my riding that we will be glad to put in the riding of anybody who would like to have it.

I have to believe that in this day and age we have (a) the scientific expertise and brains that will be able to solve the danger problems that may occur at nuclear power stations and in nuclear developments, and (b) the power and the will to be able to dispose properly of nuclear waste so that all the people of this province will be able to benefit from this power development. I really think historians will look on the history of this province and what goes on now as one of those watersheds where the development of nuclear power and the development of this resource for the ongoing economic life of this province is crucial.

I just used Hydro as an example because it comes up time and time again, from Sir Adam Beck's time right up until now, as one of those

issues that has been woven into the economic life and development of this province and the philosophies of political parties. I am proud to say I am a member of a party that I think has always been on the right side of that issue.

Mr. Stokes: You told me you were going to speak for only five minutes.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I have two more things I want to say, though. I think this article expresses so well my philosophy as a Conservative, as someone who joined the Conservative Party at age 15 and who has never belonged to any other party. This represents my philosophy and that of this party.

Peter Oliver said—and I am not going to read the whole article because I would not presume to. I am not even sure that all my colleagues here will agree with this article, but—

Mr. Stokes: Come on, read it all.

Hon. Mr. Wells: He said: "Given the reality of the Suncor purchase and the raw exercise of provincial power and cavalier interference with private property demonstrated by the trust company affair, the concerns of businessmen and neo-conservatives alike is understandable. Yet the actions of the Davis government, while undeniably bold and forceful, did not really represent a significant departure from economic policies followed by previous administrations.

"Indeed, Davis and his colleagues, whether consciously or not, were drawing on deeply rooted Ontario traditions and values which have existed since the province's earliest origins and have shaped the economic policies of every Ontario government"—get this—"every Ontario government whatever its political complexion. Throughout the province's history, governments have never hesitated to assert the absolute priority in economic life of public rights over private privileges, and at times those governments have been none too tender in their attitude to the claims of private property and business."

Then he goes on to say: "Examples of the province's powerful statist tradition could easily be multiplied. Seen in this light, the activities of the Davis government in the Suncor and trust company affairs are neither extreme nor unusual, although only time will determine whether the Suncor purchase was economically astute."

8:20 p.m.

I digress here. This is not Peter Oliver speaking. I am now saying I happen to believe the future will show the Suncor purchase was both

economical and very astute. It will serve the people of Ontario well.

I am now back to quoting Peter Oliver: "Most assuredly, neither of these initiatives"—that is Suncor or our trust company bills that were recently brought in—"would have surprised, much less shocked, such great Tories of yesteryear as John Beverley Robinson, Adam Beck, James Whitney or even Leslie Frost. In Ontario, governments, whether Conservative or Liberal, have seldom shied away from strong interventions in the provincial economy. In doing so, they have drawn on statist traditions and practices dating back to the province's Loyalist origins and sustained and reinforced throughout the 19th and early 20th centuries.

"When private and public interests have come into conflict, this statist ideology has determined that private interests frequently suffer. To date the Ontario electorate has never expressed disapproval of governments which embody and express the traditions of the positive state."

To me, that has been the whole tradition of this party, a party which has believed in the people of Ontario, in their innate freedom and individuality and in the enterprise of the people and of business in this province. It has given them full scope to develop, both the people and business, but we have never shied away from intervening, helping, assisting or doing something when the collective interests of the private sector could not do that.

Having said that, I think the important thing today is to look at that background so that it can help us map out what should be done in the future. Looking at what has to be done in the future, and remembering that we are now in this period of the beginning of confidence, the restoration of confidence as we again begin to pick up economically, it is clear that at the present time the responsibility of governments all over, Canadian and Ontario, is to create the proper climate at this time for the private sector to foster growth.

It is for us to complement the efforts of business and industry through appropriate plans and programs. We have to look at the kind of intervention we have done in the past and we have to be sure we do those things that will now allow the private sector, the individual and the small businessman to move ahead, to capture this period now and develop jobs.

Mr. Stokes: It is called the mixed economy.

Hon. Mr. Wells: It is called a mixed economy;

that is right. We have always had a mixed economy in this province.

Let me conclude by referring to one other thing that was in the speech from the throne, something which I think is very important. That is the announcement of the bicentennial in this province. Next year, 1984, we will be celebrating 200 years since those first Loyalist settlements were established in 1784 along the St. Lawrence River. While there were certainly other people in the province to a very limited degree before that and, of course, the native peoples had been here for many years before, one has to pick some time to say, "When did all this begin in this province?"

Next year we begin by celebrating the event that occurred in 1784. In 1784, a group of United Empire Loyalists came and they joined with a number of traders, francophone people from Lower Canada who had established settlements here, and the native peoples; together, they began to build this province.

The theme of the bicentennial is "Celebrating together." That means we are not celebrating that one event that occurred in 1784, we are celebrating 200 years of history. We are celebrating those people who came and all the people who have come to this province since then.

We all know there have been a myriad of people from many lands, people who have seen this as the one land in the world where they wanted to come. It was the place where they knew they could have freedom, they could come, establish a home and grow, and that it would be a great place for their children and their children's children.

That is what the bicentennial is all about. It is about celebrating together the fact that all of us have built this province in these last 200 years.

Mr. Riddell: Has an invitation been sent to the Queen yet?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Oh, yes, I would presume so. We do not send the invitations, the federal government does. We hope that the Queen will come.

We all know the many people who came here. My father came to Ontario about 1912. Many of our parents came here, many of our friends came from all different countries.

What I wanted to draw to the House's attention tonight, as I close, is the fact that we have a special group of people in the galleries tonight. These are people who will be celebrating next year with us. They have just recently come to

make a life in this province. They are already making a tremendous contribution.

This is April 28. Two days from now these people will be looking at what was a very horrendous event for them. It was April 30, 1975, the day of the fall of South Vietnam.

These people remember well that force was used by the North Vietnamese to invade their country, to break a peace accord that was signed in Paris that was supposed to bring an end to a very tragic war. They saw that the real victor in that was the communist government of North Vietnam. They saw that government and those troops march into their country. The victory of the communists in the Vietnam war is not only a great tragedy, they believe, for the 25 million people in South Vietnam, but also for the full 50 million people in their country.

I talked to a number of these people. A number of them live in many different members' ridings. I talked to one who lives in my riding. He told me that the great tragedy for the Vietnamese people was that after the communists took over in 1975 that thousands and thousands of people, officers, civil servants, former government people, were all put in prison or in places called re-education camps.

I draw this to the House's attention because we hear a lot about different celebrations where events that we all know so well are recorded. I do not think enough has been said about some of the tragedies of the invasion of South Vietnam. We all talk about the tragedy of the war and some of the occurrences that took place and all the things connected with that very unfortunate war.

But we forget the fact that when the North Vietnamese marched into South Vietnam they imprisoned a number of people, they put them in re-education camps, and my friend tells me that there are still 60,000 there in jail for political reasons. The living conditions in these camps are very poor. They have no medicine. They do not have enough food. They have to work very hard, prisoners are dying of malnutrition and those who are in jail are not in very good health.

The reason I was so keen to want to invite these people here to see our Legislative Assembly was that they want us to remember what happened there. They want us to support requests to the Vietnamese government, the communist government of Vietnam, that it will respect the human rights of those people in prison for political reasons, and that they will release these people.

It is a great tragedy for the Vietnamese people, because under the present regime in Vietnam these people have no freedom, they have no freedom of speech, they have no freedom of religion, they have no freedom of trade. They are living under a regime that they do not respect and that they do not want and which has denied them all these freedoms.

We all know that because of this lack of freedom, these terrible conditions and the imprisonment, hundreds of thousands of people risked their lives by getting into boats and taking to the high seas where many of them died in their attempt to reach freedom. Luckily, those who did not die made it to the refugee camps. Many of them have come to this country because of our federal government's policy to accept these refugees and because of the activities of many private agencies.

8:30 p.m.

It is one of the marvels of our time that churches and groups have adopted Vietnamese boat people and really helped them to establish themselves in this country. It is one of the marvellous indications of nongovernmental involvement in a very serious problem.

There were two reasons these people left their country and went through terrible hardship to get here. First was the political reason. They just did not want to be under the communist regime; they did not believe in it. They wanted to live in a democracy. They wanted the freedom of democracy.

The second reason was that they had a real concern for the future of their children. They felt their children had absolutely no hope if they were brought up under a communist regime. The standard of living is low. They were being educated in a Marxist doctrine, and they would have no chance to develop as they believed their children should develop.

They went through great deprivation and hardship, and they are now living in this province and in many other areas of the world. I understand there are approximately 22,000 Vietnamese refugees in Ontario, about 19,000 of them here in Toronto. They are hard-working. They want to integrate into our way of life. They want to make a real contribution.

From what I have seen, they are making a real contribution. They are working in the factories and in the offices. Their children are going to our schools. They are learning English quickly. They are making a contribution, and they are enjoying the freedom, democracy and the kind-

ness of all the people they meet here in this province.

It is for this reason, on this night when we are debating the throne speech and talking about our bicentennial when we will be celebrating together, that I wanted to be sure a number of these people came down to join us to see where our democracy begins in this assembly and from which flows the freedom and kind of life we have in this province.

In closing, I would like to say how pleased I am that all the Vietnamese people of Toronto who were able to come tonight have come here, and I am sure all the members of this House would like to welcome them here.

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Speaker, this is the throne debate but since the government House leader (Mr. Wells) has chosen to direct his remarks to special guests in the gallery, you might permit a representative of each of the two opposition parties to join with him in welcoming our visitors to the gallery this evening and to empathize with them in the very tragic and trying times they have experienced, not only prior to 1975 but also after 1975 with the communist takeover of South Vietnam.

We in Ontario and Canada know, and perhaps all too often take for granted, that we do have the liberties and freedoms so many people throughout the world community of nations are denied. In support of what the government House leader has said, I would just like to say to our visitors in the gallery—as part of the 20,000 people who have chosen Canada and Ontario as their home—that we are very pleased they have done so. I am sure every member of this Legislature would welcome them, wish them well and thank them very much for choosing to become Canadians.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, if you will allow me just briefly to make a few comments. I was one of the fortunate people in the late 1970s who had the opportunity, along with others, of sponsoring a family that came from Laos to our small community of Sarsfield. The process was arranged when I was the deputy reeve of the township of Cumberland.

At that time, together with a church volunteer group, we sponsored a family which arrived in the month of December. It was just a few days before Christmas when the family finally got off the bus in the city of Ottawa and came to us. At that time, I guess they had rehearsed a little sentence to say to us, and the only words they knew in English were: "Very pleased to meet you." All three of them, including the two-year-

old child, knew how to say, "Very pleased to meet you."

One year later, the father and the mother knew the English language very well and it would be appropriate to say that the little child, who was then three, spoke Laotian, English and French at the age of three. I found it absolutely remarkable that after one year in our country, somebody had learned so much of our culture. It was really most rewarding, and I feel very fortunate to have had the opportunity to participate in that kind of thing. So I would also like to welcome our visitors.

Mr. Speaker: On behalf of all members of the Legislature, I would like to echo the sentiments and thoughts that have been expressed. We who have been fortunate enough to have lived all our lives here perhaps do not really understand the true meaning of freedom which you people have chosen to share in your life with us. Thank you very much.

Mr. McGuigan: Mr. Speaker, before proceeding with the throne debate, I too would like to welcome the visitors in the gallery and join with all others who have spoken so eloquently about the contribution these people will make to Canada and how much we appreciate them here.

The closest I can come to a personal experience was when I travelled to Hong Kong and then to mainland China in 1975, just two years after relations were opened with mainland China and two years after President Nixon's visit. We were shown part of the crown colony called the New Territories. It looks across a river to a part of mainland China which is heavily fortified with machine-gun nests and various other fortifications. In spite of that, they told us people risked their lives daily to cross that river to get to Hong Kong where they would receive a different measure of freedom than existed under those conditions.

When we got out of the train to cross into mainland China, we had to give up our passports. I wish to share with others what an experience of apprehension and trepidation one feels when giving up that British passport. One feels one has given up one's rights, freedoms and perhaps the chance of coming home.

Having given up our passports, we got out of the train because the train did not cross the bridge into mainland China. We walked across the bridge. Of course, the bridge was heavily guarded by soldiers who were carrying rifles with bare bayonets. One does not often see bare bayonets on rifles, nevertheless it was a com-

mon sight there to see a bare bayonet on the rifle. I suppose it was a method of intimidating and casting fear into the hearts of all those people who see that.

8:40 p.m.

I will not spend any time talking about China but, on leaving it, one of the observations we made there was that the airplanes in China apparently are flown by inexperienced pilots. It is much easier to land your plane at a high rate of speed; in other words, flying them into the ground. The planes we were travelling on were very modern planes in 1975—they were British Tridents, I think—but every tire on every plane had the rubber worn off to the point where there were two or three plies of the fabric showing. Anyone would know that was a rather dangerous situation. Certainly one would not find an aircraft flying in this part of the world with every tire on the plane showing two or three layers of fabric.

When I looked at those tires and then looked around at the prospects of staying in China, I decided that even if the plane had no tires at all, I would take my chances on that plane rather than spend the rest of my days in that country. In spite of the fact that we were treated very well by our hosts, it was a great feeling to get back and to get those British passports once more in our hands.

We are talking tonight about the throne speech. I want to begin with my complimentary remarks about the throne speech. I want to compliment the government on the fact that they did not spend about three quarters of an hour, as they did last year, lambasting the federal government. That is not to say the federal government is perfect in every respect. They have the faults of all governments that are in power, wherever they are.

Nevertheless, just as a personal matter, it is particularly offensive to me to find that the government escapes a good deal of the honest criticism that is levelled from this side of the throne of the Legislature, a duty which the people of Ontario elected us to carry out. They escape that criticism by attacking the federal government.

In the United States we find that elections there are fought by attacking the government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Very seldom does the President of the United States really answer to the people of the United States, except to say there is a missile gap or there is a catch-up to be done and his party is going to catch up better than the other parties. The

people in the USSR do not have elections, but they maintain themselves in office by verbally attacking the United States.

We in Canada worry about when that attack will become more than verbal and become an actuality, about the fate that we and the whole world would suffer because governments avoid their responsibilities in answering their honest critics and they attack a critic who cannot talk back to them.

Tonight I was beginning to think the government House leader (Mr. Wells) had decided to change his tactics and was going back to attacking a former leader of this party, Mitch Hepburn, who has been mouldering in his grave these many years. Perhaps he was just being philosophical rather than attacking that gentleman.

I can say from the two occasions when I heard Mitch Hepburn speak—I guess this would be back in the mid-1930s; I am not sure of the dates—and I think anyone who has read about him or heard him would know that he was one of the finest speakers this province has ever produced. One of the rather bold things he did, since the government House leader was talking about boldness, was to bring about pasteurization of milk. In those days something like 30 per cent of the population of Ontario were farmers and almost all of them had a few cows on the premises.

Mr. Stokes: I thought that was Louis Pasteur.

Mr. McGuigan: He invented the process, but it was Mitch Hepburn who brought it into effect.

However, that really ends my complimentary remarks when I compliment the government for not spending the time talking about the throne speech.

I would like to talk about a matter that has been thrust upon me, not by particular choice but by events in my riding which affect people there very severely. They also affect people, particularly the farm sector, throughout Ontario. I refer to the lack of financial protection for farmers when receivers of farm products go bankrupt.

My interest was first brought to this three years ago when the Tilbury Farmers' Co-operative, a grain handling co-op, declared bankruptcy, leaving a good many of the farmers in the area holding worthless cheques or unpaid for their produce. It is rather interesting that the event that triggered the passage of the Grain Elevator Storage Act, which supposedly was to protect farmers in situations like this, also was a Kent county event that happened some time in the

1960s when a private grain company went bankrupt, leaving a number of people high and dry.

The Grain Elevator Storage Act was passed, I believe in 1975, and after that a good many people wrongly assumed they had protection and were being guarded by this government, which is so famous for its good management. I think they shared some thoughts in common with the people who invested in trust companies.

They have learned, to their chagrin and very much to their financial ruin in some cases, that the act offers them very little protection. All the act really did was to say that for receipts that were issued for storage there must be grain in that particular elevator or in a similar terminal elevator operated by the federal government. It said nothing about what would happen in the case of an operator who misappropriated that grain and sold it to his own account. It did lay out a \$1,000 fine for the first offence and a \$5,000 fine for the second offence, but that is rather small comfort to the farmer whose grain has been lost.

I just want to go over the reasons a grain company goes bankrupt. Number one would be that it was probably a high-cost facility. It may not have had volume enough to justify an operation, and I suppose you could say it might have had poor management. But in the event of a company going broke under those circumstances it would be a gradual erosion of the equity of the company; certainly the bankers, the managers and the shareholders would have ample opportunity to see what was happening to their business, because it was going broke slowly over a period of time, and they could take corrective action either in closing down the business or in adding machinery and facilities to make it a viable enterprise.

Usually the companies that go bankrupt do so because of the financial pressures that are brought about by the situation I have described; but, unlike the case I have just cited, they decide then to try to make up for their shortcomings in the operation by going into the marketplace and gambling on the future market.

There is nothing very wrong with gambling on the future market if you are using your own money. I explained in another instance that it does serve a commercial purpose in providing liquidity to the grain marketing system. But there is something very wrong when an operator uses other people's money to gamble. About 70 per cent, I think, is the figure that is used: 70 per

cent of the people who go into that market lose; only 30 per cent win.

I am not going to say very much about the reasons that the Tilbury Farmers' Co-operative went under, because I understand there is litigation going on; it will probably go on for some time. But I do say in a very general way that if you examine most of these farm elevator bankruptcies, you will find that they happen because they have really not followed the rules of the game and have gone into a situation where they were gambling either their money or the farmers' money, or at least money that they did not have and that was eventually required to pay off producers.

8:50 p.m.

Just to go over the methods that are open to these people when they are engaged in the grain trade, I will use a hypothetical case in which an elevator operator decided there was a great future in some foreign market, a premium market, two or three months down the road; so he stepped out and bought grain from the farmers at a premium price. Not having that backed up with a firm contract, when the time period ran out when he expected to pick up his contract, he found he did not have one. He had paid a premium price, had given away free storage and generally had put the company in a very bad position.

If an operator did have such a sale, there is a method whereby he can cover that situation. He takes his contract, whether it is a buy or sell contract—that is, in the cash market—and he offsets that with a paper sale on the Chicago Board of Trade or the Winnipeg Grain Exchange.

From that point on it really does not matter to his operation whether the price of grain goes up or down; his profit will be locked in in a handling charge. That handling charge would have been taken into consideration when he took his position in the market. It would not matter to him from that point on what happened in the fluctuation of the cash grain market, because whatever he lost in one transaction he would regain in the other, or whatever he gained in one transaction he would lose in the other.

What we really need in this province is a system of regulating small grain operators so they abide by the rules of the game. There are no official rules of the game as far as the province is concerned.

If one looks at the big grain companies, like Master Feeds, and the big co-operatives, like United Co-operatives of Ontario, one finds in their branch plants that they have a system

whereby their auditors will go into a branch plant on a particular day and audit the position of that branch plant as far as its buying and selling is concerned.

The two positions must match one another very closely. They cannot come out to the last bushel, because grain contracts in most cases are handled in 5,000-bushel contracts. So there could be something less than 5,000 bushels in an exposed position. If there is any more than 5,000 bushels in an exposed position, the manager of that company would be in a very serious situation. It is not unlike the banking situation when bank inspectors come in unannounced. They inspect the books and find out whether a particular branch of the bank is following all the rules.

I suggest that this provincial government has not been bold. It has avoided these situations because there might be some political fallout from them, and it has allowed people to suffer.

I bring up this subject today because this past Tuesday I was at a meeting in Chatham of 15 farmers who have recently suffered through the receivership of Southland Canning Ltd. of Wheatley. This company is only two years old. It suffered unusually bad luck. It started operating in 1981, canning tomatoes. It began with a \$350,000 Board of Industrial Leadership and Development grant to enable it to produce paste tomatoes. It had the fine objective of creating another 2,000 acres of process tomatoes, which normally are a valuable and profitable crop to the farmer.

However, in 1981 that part of Ontario suffered very bad weather and the company received only about 50 per cent of its pack, which meant all the costs of startup and operation had to be borne by half the pack. As the members can appreciate, it was an unprofitable year.

Then in 1982 there was a bumper crop. There was beautiful weather in Kent county. We did not have it so good in Elgin. They had a huge pack. The people who put up these whole-pack tomatoes—they are tomatoes that are peeled and put in a can in whole condition—packed 20 per cent of an overpack.

There is a provision in the contracts of all growers that they can only deliver 20 tons to the acre; in other words, a quota provision. Some of the bigger companies that were not concerned about whole-pack tomatoes released their growers from their contracts. I guess probably thousands of tons of those tomatoes ended up amongst a number of small companies that pack whole-pack tomatoes, each operating in what

appeared to be the best interests of that individual company. Nevertheless, it contributed to a very bad oversupply on the market.

To add to the woes of the company, subsidized whole-pack tomatoes from the European Economic Community came in and further eroded the market, although we are told the greatest damage to the market came from the overproduction here in Ontario.

This has led to the company going into receivership. As one might expect, if one knows something about Ontario agriculture, the very last person in the chain of succession in that receivership is the producer who made the whole thing possible in the first place. Were it not for these producers, there would be no factory, there would be no canning company, there would be no workers in that factory and there would be no suppliers. The producer stands at the end of the list of receivers.

You would have shed a tear, Mr. Speaker, if you had been at that meeting. These were largely new producers, younger producers, who wanted to get into the area of producing canning crops. They could not get a contract at Heinz, Campbell Soup or some of the major canners where one would not expect a bankruptcy situation to appear; so they took a chance on this smaller company.

In a great many cases they were backed by their parents, and at this moment they are going to get only about 25 per cent of the money that is owing to them. That may not seem too bad if they are only going to lose 75 per cent but, when one looks at the figures that are involved, many of these young fellows will still be left with debts owing to them of \$30,000, \$40,000 and \$50,000.

These are people who bought land in a high-priced market in the past two or three years. They were suffering already from the downturn in most commodity prices, and only by dint of the fact that probably the wife worked or they worked off the farm in their off-time, and because they had gone into canning crop production rather than grain, corn or beans, was there any chance of them succeeding in the first place. I do not wish to assume to know what is going to happen to those people, but I think it is fair to say some of them will have to cease their operations completely.

If they do continue operating as farmers, they will place their parents in an untenable situation, because they have already backed them in their initial enterprise in going into farming. They are going to have to back them further to cover the big losses that have been brought

about by this case. If there is no turnaround in the agricultural economy of Ontario, it could be the straw that breaks the backs of these older people.

People often say to us, "Why cry for the young farmer? The young farmer can quit, he can go into another form of enterprise, he can take a job, he can start life anew." As hard as that is, there is a certain amount of truth in it. But when these young farmers drag down their parents, I can tell you there is not very much room for those parents to start life anew, to try and regain their position.

9 p.m.

It was a rather sad meeting I attended. At this particular meeting, just as a matter of interest, the federal government, through the Agricultural Products Board was making an offer to purchase 540,000 cases of whole packed tomatoes and they were offering the premium price. The receiver has allowed the premium price to pass through the bankruptcy and go to the farmers.

This is really a situation that should exist in all of these bankruptcy situations. I wish to point out that it does exist in the United States, in the legislation they have in that country. For many years, the livestock people in the United States operated under their Packers and Stockyard Act which has two main provisions in it. One is that animals had to be paid for within 24 hours of being received. There was a very practical reason for that. Most animals shed their skin within 24 hours of reaching the gates of the packing plant. Of course, the identification is on the hide and it is because of that particular circumstance that it was written into the law that the producers had to be paid within 24 hours. That takes care of the day-to-day operations of a packing plant and guarantees that a farmer could not be any worse off than not being paid for the products he has delivered within 24 hours.

In the event of a bankruptcy, the producers there are further protected by the fact that all the moneys received for meat products from that packing plant or stockyard go into a trust fund and those funds can only go out of that trust to producers. They cannot go to anyone else. So when there is a bankruptcy in the United States—unless there are bankruptcies all along the line, going right back to the consumer—the producer would be paid.

I bring this up because at the present moment there is a movement in the United States under the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, which is an act that governs the sale and terms of

sale for fresh fruits and vegetables. Under that particular act, farmers must be paid within 10 days. The practical reason is that for many of the shipping areas in the United States the time involved really requires about 10 days for produce to arrive. Yet in Canada, if one looks in the present situation here in Ontario, one will find that most shippers of those commodities probably will be lucky if they are paid within 30 days and many times it stretches out to 60 days.

Also, in that country at the present moment, there is a great debate going on among members of the United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Growers. I guess this is the equivalent of our Canadian Horticultural Council or our Ontario Fruit and Vegetable Growers. They have put forward a proposal that a trust situation be enacted by an amendment to the PACA law that would create a trust situation in the event of a bankruptcy for a receiver of fresh fruits and vegetables.

This proposal brought a great deal of opposition when it was first brought upon the industry because people saw themselves setting up a set of books within their set of books which would cause a great deal of difficulty. However, they have examined this very closely and have determined that under the law they would not have to change their bookkeeping situation and that the trust provision would only come into effect if and when a bankruptcy occurred.

In the case of the Southland Canning, when they were forced into bankruptcy, the stock on hand, the inventory, the accounts that were owing to them would go into a trust that would go to the farmers.

Another event that happened in the last two or three years in my riding was the bankruptcy of a cattle yard that has cost producers upwards of \$4 million. The figure really is not known because those matters are also before the courts and some lawsuits are being carried on, so I certainly do not wish to get into the details of it.

Mr. Stokes: Tell us how the Thompsons are doing in Blenheim.

Mr. McGuigan: I do not think those people are in any danger of going bankrupt, and I do not think I care to comment.

But there is a case of one family in my riding where a father and son are now trying to make that intergeneration change, passing down the farm from father to son. The father is perhaps 60 or 70 years old. This is a difficult enough situation as it is, trying to provide adequate funds for the parents to live their retirement days in comfort and at the same time not putting a burden on the son beyond his ability to carry.

Add to that a \$60,000 dead loss—he did get a few thousand dollars, \$13,000 out of it—or let us say with a \$50,000 dead loss to add on to that situation, it really becomes a question of whether or not the proposal will fly.

I know from my own family operation, when one is hit by bad weather or circumstances, those losses are very difficult, if not impossible, to make up. For some time afterwards, we do not make that purchase that we should make in order to keep the farm modern, to keep up with the competition. We try to cut corners this way and that way, but really we cannot cut corners with Mother Nature. Eventually we pay for having cut those corners. This puts a terrible burden on those people who are making an intergenerational change.

This puts a burden on anybody, at any time, to suffer such losses. I would point out that one of the reasons this is so critical today, and why I keep bringing this point up, is to try to impress upon the government the fact that farmers do accept the risks of the marketplace. They try to offset those risks as best they can. Some of them use the futures market, they use forward contracting, they try to some extent to diversify their production so they do not have all their eggs in the proverbial basket.

Nevertheless, with specialization, which is the key to economical production, they find themselves limited to very few operations. They find themselves limited to just a few sales in the course of the year. In fact, it is not unknown for a grain farmer to sell his entire year's production in one sale. A cattle producer could maybe sell a quarter of his year's production in one transaction.

So it is not a case of a farmer losing half a dozen head of cattle on a particular sale and then having his chickens, sheep, milk cows, grain crops and his garden crop to fall back on. He has very little to fall back on. This government has been derelict in its duty and has not shown very much of the boldness that the House leader spoke about and Peter Oliver talked about in the article which the House leader referred to so many times.

They have not shown that boldness. They have waited until these events occur and then, spurred on by the trauma of the situation, they have moved in and brought about some changes.

9:10 p.m.

Following the bankruptcy of McIntyre cattle sales, they did move in and implemented the Farm Products Payments Act, which has been on the books for many years. They set up an

insurance fund that from here on guarantees to pay producers for their cattle in such a situation.

That did nothing for the people who really triggered off that particular action, the people who really became the sacrificial lambs. They laid down their economic life in order, not voluntarily mind you, that others would benefit.

In spite of the fact the major farm organizations have endorsed the principle that these producers be paid retroactively when funds in the insurance build up to the point where payments could be made without borrowing, in spite of the fact that other farmers have supported them in their hour of need, the government stands by and says: "That is only a few. They are not going to affect us very much electorally."

It was their fault, too, in some instances. I do not think they have said that in the case of these people affected by the bankruptcies, but we do find in other instances that people who represent themselves in speaking for this government, although they are not elected to that position, try to divide and conquer the farmers by saying: "It is all your fault." That is a tactic that I deplore.

I am not going to get down in the gutter and use the kind of language the civil servant used to a group of farmers, at least as it was reported in the press. I do not know where people get the notion that when they come out to talk to farmers that somehow or other they have to use foul language.

Having attended farm meetings from the time when I was about 10 years old, nothing upset me more than when a speaker would come in and make the assumption he had a bunch of dumb farmers and had to start off the meeting by telling some dirty stories. I can tell the members that some of those stories I heard were filthy, dirty stories. They were usually to the degradation of somebody's mother. They always offended me. Even today they offend a lot of farm people. They make the farmers' wives absolutely furious.

I have seen it happen at farm meetings where a voice has been given to that offence and people have been made to apologize. I am telling you this from the bottom of my heart. Perhaps some of these farm people are in dire straits through their own fault, perhaps they made the wrong move, perhaps they were guilty of putting faith in this government, perhaps they answered the call that has been coming from our colleges, universities and from our farm advisers to specialize, to expand and to move out into that market and become a big operator, maybe that is all they are guilty of.

But they do not need to be talked down to, they do not need to be treated like dirt and they do not need to be hurt in their hour of real trauma.

One of the things I learned as a student in agriculture was from a chap called Dr. Raymond, who was our English professor and who turned out to be a psychologist.

One of the things he told us was about the love that a farmer has for his land. This really goes back to the fact that homo sapiens are territorial animals—the same as most animals of this world are territorial. We look upon Mother Earth as a suckling child would look at its mother's breast, as the source of all life. That is their contact with the good things of this world. When they are in danger of losing that land; whether it is through omissions they may have made themselves, or whether it is simply that they believed in government or whether it is just a matter of circumstances—they happened to start farming at the wrong time, they happened to move into it just at the wrong time—whatever the circumstances, I can tell you those people feel a terrible hurt.

But on top of that, they do not need a provincial civil servant using foul language at them. They do not need to be caught in bankruptcies that add to the other economic woes they have and the problems they are willing to face within the marketplace. They do not need those.

This government sits back and waits for these events to happen. Reluctantly and slowly, they move in. The Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Timbrell) has said in the throne speech that he is going to move on the Grain Elevator Storage Act and is going to bring about some measure which will ensure that grain placed in storage, given to the trust of that operator, remains his until it is actually paid for. We all want to see that. We applaud that, but we do wonder what particular measures he is going to bring about to accomplish that.

Because when that grain moves out of the elevator and goes to a breakfast food company or a feed company or a distillery, if that grain is misappropriated, if it were taken out of the elevator without the authority of the farmer, that receiver might find himself in the same position that you or I might find ourselves in when we buy a car that has a lien on it. We might have to pay for that grain twice.

Two of the ways of handling this situation I have already described are the ones used in the United States. If the minister has another alter-

native method, all fine and dandy. Of course there are a number of methods that are available to him. One is the insurance fund that he has already brought in for cattle producers.

The government has stood back in the past and said: "Well, you have your Farm Products Marketing Act. You have these things all within your control. It is up to you to look after yourself." There is some measure of truth in that. But when one examines the practical situation, one finds the people who are elected to these various marketing boards are usually the well-established people, the people who sell their goods, in the case of canning crops, to Heinz or Libby McNeill and Libby of Canada, or they will sell them to Campbell Soups and they will not be very much concerned about the possibility, as far as they are personally concerned, of that company going broke.

They are not concerned as directors—or at least they put into the background their duty as directors—to enter into this particular area of the contract because they go into Heinz or whatever company it may be to negotiate the very best possible price they can negotiate for those growers. So, they are reluctant to bring up the business of providing for a check-off that would provide for money to be set aside in an insurance fund to largely protect the producers who are growing for the competitors of these main companies. It is quite understandable that the mainline companies are not anxious to put themselves to extra bookkeeping trouble and to take off a fee which they probably fear, and perhaps rightly so, may become negotiated into the price another year so that it becomes an added cost to them.

9:20 p.m.

The result of all these economic and psychological things as far as marketing is concerned is that not very much attention is paid to the matter of financial integrity for producers of farm crops. One may very well argue that, if some of these measures are brought in, especially the matter of putting funds into a trust fund, banks would be a little more cautious in lending money to processors. I think that is probably true. They would be more cautious, and well they might be more cautious. Under the present circumstances, they do not have to be cautious at all. They do not have to worry about putting money into a processing plant as far as the interest of the bank is concerned, because they simply know that, if they wait until the proper seasonal day when most of the produce of that season has been deposited with

the company, there will be all kinds of money there for them to grab. Being the secured creditors that they are, they grab those products.

I personally suffered under one of these bankruptcies quite a number of years ago. There was a small canner to whom I was delivering peaches. My account was not a great one, although the account would have bought me a new car. At the time, I was driving an old clunker and for the next four or five years, every time I got into that old beast, I muttered under my breath at that canning company and that bank for doing me out of the price of a new car.

The interesting point about this case was that a neighbouring farmer who had about 10 times as much money involved as I did and who was getting concerned about the safety of delivering his product to the canner had written to the bank asking them for an opinion as to the safety of his delivery. He got a very nice letter back from the bank saying he had nothing to worry about, this company was in good financial shape, and he should continue to deliver his peaches. On the very day the contract ended—I suppose September 25 would be the last day of the contract; we will say for argument's sake it was September 25—the bank moved in and seized all the pack. They got paid off at four cents on the dollar. I got a cheque for \$64. So one can imagine what happened to the chap who had delivered 10 times the amount of product I had to that company.

The point is that the banks under these circumstances can seize goods that may legally belong to them but certainly morally do not belong to them. That product we have delivered to our receiver is the product of our labour. It is just as much a product of labour as the people who work in that particular factory are labour. I am not an expert on labour law, but I do understand that labour comes quite high on the list of people who receive money in the case of bankruptcy. At least if there is any money there, they are certainly at the top level, whereas those of us who put our labour into these situations in the form of goods are at the very bottom of that list.

I think it is morally wrong and just plain bad business to have such a cushion under the banks that they really do not have to be very careful about the situation. One could argue that this would cut off some small people from starting in business.

I should tell members that under this United States legislation they do have provision that when a producer wants to take the chance or wants to sign a waiver saying that he will give up

his right to the products he delivers and he knowingly goes in—and it cannot be a verbal contract; it has to be in writing—or he determines that he wants to take such a chance or is financially in a position to take such a chance, he can do it. It has to be known and it has to be up front. It has to be known by the regulatory bodies that govern the legislation, and it has to be in writing.

I submit that there are many ways in which this situation can be cleaned up. I accuse the government of lacking boldness and lacking a real commitment to this. They only act under duress. The last speaker was talking about the boldness of this government and why they have stayed in power these many years. One of the reasons, I would submit, is their lack of boldness. The boldness we have seen in this country, in the form of crop insurance, in the form of marketing legislation, in the form of most—something like 95 per cent—most of the stabilization, the good social legislation we have in Canada in medicare and unemployment insurance: those have been the result of Liberal governments, provincially and federally. It is a long time since we have had them provincially, but the marketing legislation we have in this province was brought about by a provincial Liberal government.

Interjections.

Mr. McGuigan: The member for Middlesex (Mr. Eaton) has pointed out that it is really the government system of gradualism, and it is that system of gradualism that has kept them in power; they have built on that very farm legislation.

But I give them full credit. I give credit especially to the member sitting beside him for the wise counsel he has given over the years in his position as assistant to a number of Ministers of Agriculture and Food. They have been building on that base, and gradually we have a good system; that question has never been under attack. But it does have the one weakness that I pointed out: the people who administer it, for very logical reasons that one can understand, have stayed away from that area of financial protection.

As the government House leader has said, it is government's duty to step in and do those things for people that they cannot do for themselves. The people who are suffering today are going to be affected for years and years to come, and it should not have happened. It was predictable; anybody who saw these downturns in the economy starting about 1979 would have known that

we were going to be faced with bankruptcies. I am concerned because I know we are going to be faced with more bankruptcies, not just the three that have occurred.

Certainly I will speak about this time and time again until I see some movement on the part of this government. They have made some great promises in the throne speech. We stand here prepared to offer suggestions. We are going to give them positive criticisms of whatever they bring up, and we are going to be as shrill as an opposition can be that whatever legislation is brought in will be just, will be workable and will give some protection to the primary producers of this province.

There are a number of other items that I could talk about, but I wanted to limit myself to this one area because it has been so prevalent in my riding during the last three years. It is a personal concern.

9:30 p.m.

I see further farm bankruptcies coming down the line as we go about the major restructuring spoken about at the outlook conference the minister had a few days ago, when he had the discourtesy not to invite some of us who could at least have been observers if not active participants. I do not think we have been known for showing misbehaviour or discourtesy at such meetings. We could have been there. It could have been a service we could have rendered back to our constituents, the people who elected us, who have faith in us and who look to us for guidance.

At that very meeting, it was pointed out we are going through major restructuring and there are going to be a great many painful situations we will have to face in the future. Face these situations we will, but we want to face them with whatever civility, dignity and human compassion we can offer to people who find themselves caught in these terrible situations.

We are believers in the free enterprise system. The free enterprise system has winners and it has losers. At least we could give those losers the best legislation to ease the situation to let them go out with a bit of dignity, as is being attempted at the present moment by our federal colleague from Lambton-Middlesex.

I find it sad that the government opposite has taken exception to that act and is opposing it. It is knuckling down to the threats coming from the bankers. The bankers are saying: "If you pass this act, we are really going to get you guys. We are going to withdraw from agricultural financing." They say, "We withdrew following

the passage of the act in 1934 and we will withdraw again."

If one goes back to the literature and reads the accounts of what happened, one will find the banks withdrew in 1931, three years before that act was passed. They have been withdrawing for at least a year in the present situation and since that act has been introduced they have been soft-peddalling their situation.

The farmers of Ontario should not be intimidated by such talk. Agriculture is still one of the safest places one can put money in a free enterprise system. It is recognized by the people of Europe. It is recognized by the people of North America. They are rushing to bring their money over here to put it in agriculture because they realize that while the returns may not be as great as they could get in other ventures nevertheless it is a safe place for their money. When all else fails the land will still be there, it will offer safe haven for them.

I feel sorry this government has not seen fit to act, that it is not showing a bit of humanity in these situations and is not supporting the Ontario farmer to the extent it should in his hour of need.

Mr. Cousens: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate in this throne speech debate. I think a tremendous amount has been said already in a number of areas. The member for Sarnia (Mr. Brandt) spoke about technology and the things that are happening there. The member for Lakeshore (Mr. Kolyn) talked about the needs of the auto pact. There is the heart shown by the member for Kent-Elgin (Mr. McGuigan). The concern he is showing for the farmers is concern we all have to be involved with.

If we look at what is happening in our economy, we see a sense of optimism developing out of the throne speech. There is a sense of movement, a sense the economy is going to improve and a sense of hope. We certainly know the past year has been a difficult one, but we also know the future is starting to augur well for many people.

Yet I do not think any of us wants to forget about the hardships many people have endured over the past year. It has been difficult for many: the unemployed, the very young, the disadvantaged, the handicapped, the infirm and the old. There are very many people in this province who have not had an easy time.

Tonight in my presentation I would like to speak on the subject of the concern that our government is showing towards people. As one who comes out of the field of industry, I feel

many of those areas have already been addressed, but I would like also to give an emphasis that is present within this government, this House, for those people who are pulling through and can look forward to better times. I can look with pride at the kind of thing our government has done—

Interjections.

Mr. Cousens: All that member can do is talk. He has never been able to do anything except criticize. Why does he not listen the way we try to listen to him? Our government wants to do something and he does not even want to listen.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy) is not even in his proper seat. Therefore, you should not pay any attention to his interjections.

Mr. Cousens: Within our government we have in place now for Ontarians the financial and social nets that were not there during the Depression years when things were very tough. There have been many things that our government has done over the last many years that have helped relieve some of the discomfort that would otherwise have been there, to help individuals and families during these difficult economic times of social stress.

At the beginning of a new session of the Legislature, at a time when there is increasing hope, I am proud the speech from the throne confirms our government's continued commitment to the wellbeing of the citizens of this province. During the Depression—I was born in the latter part of it—there was an absence of social programs. There was a lack of comprehensive family and social services. It meant that untold numbers of people suffered far more.

Today, what we have in Ontario is a depth of social services. You just have to look around the world, and where would you rather live? There is no other place I would rather be than in Ontario. Yet to hear some others talk, one would think they would rather be somewhere else. Maybe if they were, it would be comforting for some of us to see them move.

Approximately two thirds of Ontario's spending goes to support social programs. This amounts to some \$13,929,000,000 in the fiscal year 1982-83. Those moneys are going to support the needs of people in this province. These are not recent innovations—

Interjection.

Mr. Cousens: The member does not know what he is talking about. Our province goes back over 20 years in developing social pro-

grams. It has developed them. It introduced medicare—

Mr. Speaker: Order. The honourable member for York Centre has the floor. The member for Ottawa Centre or any of his colleagues had the opportunity to have the floor prior to that. They chose not to, for whatever reason, and I would ask them please not to interject and allow the member for York Centre to continue.

Mr. Cousens: Thank you. It must be very difficult for certain members to control themselves. There is another point of view. The point of view I am trying to present is certainly one that stands on the evidence that people have across this province who know that this province has something that is worth while. That is, there are programs and services and there is a commitment.

Our government has shown that commitment to maintain these services, as we go to try to help those children who are disturbed, as we go into the communities and help those communities that have special needs, as we go and help the aged with their special programs. There are so many areas in which our government has gone to work to help these people. In 1973—

9:40 p.m.

Mr. Cooke: Don't be silly.

Mr. Cousens: The member is being silly when he does not acknowledge what we have.

The other thing that stands forward is that our government continues in the face of a tough economy to maintain its commitment to these genuine areas.

Mr. Cooke: Come to my home town.

Mr. Cousens: Those are not just words; we are talking significant dollars.

Mr. Speaker: Will the member for York Centre please address his remarks to the Speaker and not to the individual members?

Mr. Cousens: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is very difficult when other honourable members do not fully appreciate—

Mr. Cassidy: On a point of order: I just want to say that with the magnanimity of experience around here, I am prepared to accept that some good things have occasionally come from the government; but in the face of the worst crisis this province has had for 40 years, this is the most abysmal throne speech in 40 years.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Having said that, I do not know what it has to do with order.

Mr. Cousens: Mr. Speaker, I certainly appreciate your intervention at this point because, as

one who is concerned about the future of this province, I know the future is based on the solid foundation that has been built over a number of years.

When we look at the kinds of things our government has done, we saw in 1973 the establishment of the Provincial Secretariat for Social Development. This was something that began to co-ordinate even more Ontario's social programs for social development. Since then, policies have been directed towards the consolidation and co-ordination of social services and towards reducing government bureaucracy in the delivery of these services. In fact, if one looks at the ratio of our cost of delivery to the services presented, it is the best of any province in this country.

In recent years, changing social conditions and changing population trends have had a profound effect on government social programs in that more emphasis has been directed towards helping families in such areas as provision of day care for both the young and the elderly, counselling services for young mothers and parents, and aid for the handicapped. Let me just touch this evening on some of the areas where our government has done something in support of children's services.

Interjections.

Mr. Cousens: At your request, Mr. Speaker, I am trying to ignore these interjections, which do not really assist anyone in understanding what is going on. Some people have to listen and learn, and I see they have trouble in doing that.

What I would like to touch on, first of all, is something of the services in support of children in this province. Substantial improvements have taken place over the last decade in programs for children, day care and community support services for the developmentally handicapped. Expenditures in the children's services program in 1982 and 1983 approximate \$399 million. During the past year, additional funds were utilized to improve child abuse programs and foster care.

The government expects to expend in excess of \$500 million in 1983-84 on children's services, and \$354.5 million was allocated in 1982-83 for programs for developmentally handicapped children and individuals. This is a significant amount of care and concern our government has shown. Let us not take it for granted. Here in this country and in this province we have 17 government-operated facilities, 10 community-operated facilities and four diagnostic and treatment centres. These provide care and treatment

and training for about 7,000 developmentally handicapped persons.

In the spring of this year, the standing committee on social development investigated the problems of child abuse in Ontario. The committee's recommendations urged more legislative and administrative support for abused children. They suggested certain changes in children's aid societies, in the courts, and discussed the need for more effort in the areas of education and research in child abuse.

Responding to the committee's concern, the Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Drea) announced in March that the first child abuse treatment centre in Ontario will be established in Metro by the end of this year.

The minister also agreed with the committee that the definition of child abuse should be expanded to include emotional and social abuse, not just physical and sexual abuse. The minister has said that if the changes cannot be included in the new Children's Act he will amend the existing children's welfare legislation as soon as possible. In that regard, work is proceeding with the new Children's Act, a piece of legislation designed to consolidate and improve upon the present multitude of diverse and disparate laws relating to children.

When we look at the province we see a tremendous group of services to assist those in social need. We have general welfare assistance in this province for those who are unemployed and have a difficult time handling their own economy. There is also the family benefits assistance. Last year, special recession funds involving \$52 million were provided for both those funds.

There is a work incentive program that was set up to assist recipients of the family benefits allowance who wanted to return to full-time or part-time work. Up to March 1981, 2,440 recipients were involved in this program. Other provincial social welfare support is provided through the property and sales tax credits and also through shelter allowances.

The Ontario government also extends assistance to the working poor. These are individuals and families who are primarily dependent on employment rather than social assistance and transfer payments, but whose earnings are inadequate. There are four major assistance programs for the working poor: the Ontario tax credit, Ontario health insurance plan premium assistance, rent-geared-to-income housing and subsidized day care. These are all important

programs for those people who otherwise would have an even more difficult struggle.

But our government has shown the kind of concern it should in these fundamental areas and has made the commitment to retain and continue to support them. Not only is our government interested in youth, social and welfare programs, but there is a genuine and sincere commitment by the government to the needs of the elderly.

The whole area of the elderly, with their needs, is a matter of great significance. Seniors have made vast contributions to our communities throughout their lives; they have made a great contribution to the economy of this province and to our country. Therefore, it is essential we recognize their effort and the problems they are having now in coping with these uncertain times.

Universal assistance to our seniors is largely a federal responsibility, but, as we are already witnessing, universal social programs are easy targets for the federal government in its drive slowly to recapture its funds and control of its budget by removing the expenditure of those funds in this needy area.

Already the federal government has taken steps in this direction by cutting back on its share of transfer payments to the province. Such cutbacks affect provincial social service capabilities, but of all people, the elderly should be the last to be the victims of squabbles between two levels of government. Even though the basic responsibility for helping seniors lies with the federal government, Ontario has stepped in where Ottawa has hesitated.

The support offered by the Ontario government to its seniors includes the property tax credit, temporary assistance to reduce home heating costs and the sales tax rebate program. Pensioners are eligible for the guaranteed annual income system, which is a payment to supplement their income. They are entitled to free OHIP. They are covered by free prescriptions, the Ontario dental/drug benefit plan. Elderly persons in need of income support for themselves or their dependants, and who are not eligible for old age security and guaranteed income supplements, can receive provincial assistance through the family benefits program or the general assistance program.

Ontario also tries to help seniors through cost-share programs with the municipalities. Two of the financial assistance programs that help many are the supplementary aid for seniors program and the assistance to Ontario senior

citizens of the rental housing program. For those less able to cope on their own, the province, in co-operation with the municipalities, supports the Ontario charitable homes for the aged and the Ontario municipal homes for the aged. Municipal homes provide extended care services.

I am proud of the many things our province does in support of its seniors. Other health care programs are also available to our seniors. The Ontario nursing program is certainly one of them, for we are able to give them extra care and attention.

9:50 p.m.

A few days ago when the member for York South (Mr. Rae) was making his presentation, although I have always had a great respect for him and always will, I am sure, because of his leadership ability and his intelligence, when I saw him making his presentation, I had a different vision of him as leader. I saw him as something of a painter. Instead of a pallet and a fine brush for painting, he really had in his hand a pail of black paint and a wide brush, and it was his job to paint everything black. That is the kind of thing we really must beware of, a black bias that takes things to one direction without seeing a perspective to it.

I do not want to take the other side and say we are whitewashing things, and I do not want to say we are taking too much of an extreme. However, in this whole area there is a sense of balance that we should maintain, and when he started the kind of comments about nursing home care being run by a private sector and that is bad, or someone making a profit on it and that being bad, I began to wonder where it really is they are coming from. In fact, the concern of so many in nursing home care is that of the patient and those who need that care.

We see that as a very important and fundamental service in this province, that we continue to provide excellent nursing home care to those who need it. In fact, we see that in this province, where we have the Ontario Nursing Home Association working closely with the Minister of Health and senior health officials, discussing common concerns and working towards a better system.

This is a people industry, with a quarter of a billion hours of care being given each year to those who need it. Problems can enter, not only in government-run nursing care centres but also in privately run centres, and they always will because there are people there making judgments. Nonprofit does not mean there are no

problems, and that is the bottom line that is offered in this black picture that is painted by the member for York South.

We often hear, as we did the other day, the negatives. There were a number of letters read about people who had complaints about nursing home care. I wonder where all those other letters are that people have written to the administrators and others, saying how happy they were with the care they were receiving. What about the relatives who know there is something very worth while happening. This was not mentioned in that speech.

There is a concern about a monopoly somewhere in running nursing homes. I happen to believe that in the nursing homes I have seen that are run by hospitals and by municipalities, and also by the private sector, there is something very worth while going on. In fact as I have visited the nursing homes in my riding, there has been a changing need in those homes over the last number of years. Ten years ago one in particular had the average age of its residents as 71; the average age now, 10 years later, is 81 years of age.

So there is an increasing need to improve and modify those services to meet the needs of those patients who are becoming more elderly.

There was some concern in that honourable member's speech about people being drugged. I suggest that is not a problem in the nursing homes; it is a problem, if someone has one, with the doctors who prescribe the drugs, because it is not the nursing home which prescribes medicine. It is either the patient's own doctor or the nursing home doctor.

The suggestion really gives the impression that the nursing homes want to have more power and more problems. The fact is that what I see happening in those nursing homes in my riding is a sense of support and concern and care for those who need it. I also wondered, when the painter was painting his black picture, about those nursing homes that are run by union employees, who also have a very genuine concern for the residents and the people they are serving. I wondered if they too were being painted by the same black brush.

I listened to the speech and I have a sense of concern. If we are going to be successful in this province it will not be by just giving everything to the government to run; it is up to the family and the community also to get involved to support the needs of these homes and these residents as they become older. Sometimes there is a problem of people abdicating their

responsibility and maybe we should be doing more to encourage more community involvement in these programs.

I also heard the honourable member make great criticism of one particular company that has a nursing home near my riding with Extendicare. I can just say that the member failed to appreciate the fact that, when he was indicating that Extendicare owned so many homes—it owned 16—one of them in my riding is a beautiful facility providing excellent care. So I would beware, and ask others to beware of broad generalizations that really do not lead anyone anywhere.

I ask members to look at the positive side of things. There is not just a black side; there is a sense of momentum and movement within this whole program that has a concern for people. As we see a creditation program developing, those problems that have been addressed will be resolved, and there will be a continuing effort to clean up those little problems where they exist.

When I have seen problems I have gone to the administrator or I have gone to the Minister of Health and they have responded to them, rather than making a spectacle within the House to draw attention to a particular incident. I happen to believe there are other ways of solving the problems and that is by working with people and by promoting good things and giving an example to work towards. I see that happening through a number of developments and programs that are taking place.

There are ways we can go ahead and that is to be proactive rather than reactive. I see our Minister of Health giving the kind of leadership to these areas that we want to have within this government.

The provision of good nursing home care has always been a priority of our health care system. When at any time the ministry has reason to believe that standards are not being maintained, it has moved in swiftly to investigate the situation. When serious deficiencies have been found, it has not hesitated to close down the facility and transfer the residents to another setting, or give the nursing home operator a deadline by which he must comply with Ministry of Health standards.

During 1982, for example, of the province's 340 nursing homes which were in operation during that year, 15 were closed through ministry negotiations because they did not meet the standards set out in the regulations.

I believe all of these facts speak for themselves. Within a health care system as large and diverse as ours, we know that in Ontario, from

time to time, one will be able to find problems, one will be able to isolate unique circumstances that one can blow up and make a story out of. But may I say, on the other hand, there are many good things happening within this program.

We can continue to work to make it better but we cannot paint the whole system with a black brush, as some would have us do. I do not want to paint it with a white brush, but there is a way in which we can continue to work to have a better system, and that is certainly one of our great desires.

Mr. Roy: How can he mix that white with that black paint?

Mr. Cousens: That becomes grey, and when it is grey it sort of gets to another party that is in the middle. So maybe we can have the white over here and the black somewhere else.

I do not want to be either white or black. I would like to move toward that which is best. What is happening in our province is a sincere and genuine effort by our government to move, to improve and to develop the kind of programs that mean something to people.

I think the example of the extended home care support for the elderly is an example where our government expanded services to help elderly and senior citizens to stay in their own homes longer. There are programs that people do not realize that our government supports. I would like to give credence to that. We have Meals-on-Wheels, housekeeping, home maintenance, transportation, visiting and many other kinds of valuable assistance for elderly citizens living on their own. It is another of those positive undertakings supported by our government.

10 p.m.

The government's commitment to our senior citizens was highlighted last year by the establishment of the seniors secretariat. The government believes it is important to help Ontario's seniors maintain their independence wherever possible. To this end, it has encouraged increased emphasis on home care and home support services. Rather than institutionalized care, innovative health care such as day programs, outpatient programs, and community-based health clinics are in the process of being developed as alternatives to acute hospital health care.

There are tremendous benefits for our seniors in this province. If one talks to our seniors, one knows they appreciate the services that are available. There is not a member in this House

who does not try to help the people in his or her riding by directing his or her constituents to those services so they can get the optimum advantage that is there for them. It is important for us not to take them for granted. Our government has not taken them for granted. Our government is moving to continue to improve them.

Our health care system seems to get knocked by a number of people, but the people who are the quiet majority continue to stand out there, knowing that waiting for them in case they need it is a service that is one of the best in the world—that is the service of health care in our province.

As we look at the services, there is a changing need in our province. We see the changing need of treatment of infectious diseases being replaced with degenerative and chronic cares. Our government is trying to adjust health care policy to the new realities as we see them.

For example, we are increasing the number of facilities that offer less-intensive care. There will be more outpatient clinics and more home care programs to encourage early discharge from hospitals. Public health programs will become increasingly important to educate us as to how to eat, exercise and work.

One of the things our Minister of Health is doing is to bring together this coming May a policy conference entitled Ontario's Health Care System in the 80s and Beyond. This is an important conference, one that will bring together representatives of the Ontario Medical Association, the Ontario Hospital Association, the Registered Nurses' Association of Ontario, other health care providers, planners and members of the public. The results of this conference will provide the government with guidance on the direction for Ontario's future health care system.

Mr. Cassidy: You sure kept the unions out of that one, didn't you?

Mr. Cousens: The fact is they are represented.

Multiservice centres are one response to the fragmented service provision and the Minister of Health announced a few months ago an expansion and further development of community health centres which will provide access to a range of health—

Mr. Cassidy: After Timbrell fought them for seven years.

Mr. Cousens: The honourable member is seeing progress. He is seeing the evolution where the government is continuing—

Mr. Cassidy: Why do we have to wait while stupid ministers resist progress?

Mr. Speaker: Order. Will the honourable member please refrain—

Mr. Cassidy: It is your government. He says it is good; Timbrell says it is bad.

Mr. Kolyn: Your member talked three and a half hours.

Mr. Cassidy: Martel was talking sense.

Mr. Kolyn: Baloney.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I will not caution the member for Lakeshore (Mr. Kolyn) and the member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy) further.

Mr. Cousens: The community health centres are an important step towards providing services today in a way in which more and more people can benefit from them. They will be funded in the same manner as hospitals rather than the present short-term contracts. The advantage of community health centres is they can perform many of the functions now handled by hospital emergency and outpatient departments.

We have a health care system in our province that is an enormous undertaking, and because there are so many different professional groups, institutions, agencies and public interest associations legitimately involved in its provision, the people of Ontario—

Mr. Kerrio: You said “we had.”

Mr. Cousens: Have; it is present tense. It is the present tense and it is something that is continuing to improve.

Interjection.

Mr. Cousens: No, I am in this House in the company of good people. It is a relatively easy thing for someone to single out one area for criticism, but the fact is health care is one of those areas that is of significant importance to our government. It is the single biggest expenditure which is made each year by this government.

During the past fiscal year, 1982-83, health care alone accounted for \$6.7 billion and represented nearly one third of the total revenues available for allocation. The health care system of our province is truly among the best that can be found anywhere in the world. The government of this province is determined to protect that tradition and that reputation.

Last year when things were tough, in response to a Health ministry request for additional funding to develop a new budgeting formula for our public general hospitals, cabinet agreed to

provide the ministry with moneys totalling \$110 million. This new funding adjustment has since been made in the Ontario Hospital Association, and the great majority of our individual hospitals have responded positively and enthusiastically to the new financial arrangement.

I would also like to point out that these funds were protected for the health care system during a time of economic difficulty in this province and during a time when there were numerous other worthy and important demands being made for government support. I would point out that this decision was made at a time when the federal government had seen fit to export its own deficit problems to the provinces by cutting back on the revenue guarantees of the established programs financing arrangement. Our provincial cabinet made a decision that was therefore a clear illustration of this government's commitment to preserve the excellence in health care that the people of Ontario enjoy.

In the past few months new initiatives have been undertaken in the mental health area. New community-based services are now in place for former psychiatric patients, and more are under development. Patient advocates are also being appointed to our provincial psychiatric hospitals to assist patients in their relations with the hospitals and to better understand their legal and treatment circumstances. Community advisory bodies have also been appointed to the hospitals to promote the development of better relations with their local communities and for a better understanding of local mental health needs.

Indeed, it is a well-known fact to every member of this House that the development of new mental health services is a priority of the Minister of Health and that within the next few years we will see many dramatic changes in the provision of this vital health care service. A complete review of mental health care in Ontario is now being completed, and it is expected that the final report of this exhaustive study will be ready by early this summer.

Better health services mean people are living longer, and the baby boom generation now coming to maturity means that shortly after the turn of this century we will see in Ontario a growth of nearly 58 per cent in the number of senior citizens. This group already accounts for almost one third of the demand on health care services, so it is readily apparent that the implications for our future health care system are significant.

With an eye on these strategic developments,

the Health ministry is now embarking on a major expansion of home care programs to assist elderly residents to maintain an independent and productive life in their own communities. Home care is now available in some 36 out of 38 Ontario regions and districts. The two remaining regions will have home care service by the end of the current fiscal year.

We can also expect, however, on the basis of the record of this government and its commitment to health care for the people of Ontario, that any problems or difficulties will be quickly identified and the appropriate actions will be taken to maintain the excellence in health care of which we are justifiably proud.

Our government is there to continue to provide the best people services it possibly can within the financial limitations that its budget can provide. Even though we build a deficit, we continue to maintain those important fundamental services for the people of this province. Our child care, our elderly care, our social assistance, our day care, our nursing home care—these and many programs continue to provide the kind of lifestyle that we have come to expect and take for granted.

May I say to all of us that we should not take it for granted. Like the padre at the Empire Club today, who began the luncheon with his prayer giving thanks for the bounty we have in this province and this country, maybe there should be a little bit more thankfulness for all the good things we have and—

Mr. Kerrio: There is going to be a mutiny on that Bounty, I'm telling you right now.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Cousens: There is going to be a mutiny over there, I think.

10:10 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Bradley: What about the Albany Club?

Mr. Cousens: No, this was the Empire Club. It was simply those of all parties and all concerns having a concern about the future of our country. This to me is something that makes one proud to be part of this province.

Mr. Bradley: Who was the guest speaker?

Mr. Cousens: We had an excellent speech by the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Mr. Bennett), an outstanding speech, which reiterated the importance of people and the concern that government has to have for people.

There is a number of other things one could say on this throne speech, but I would like to

leave a little for the other members of this party. It certainly makes me proud to be part of a government that shows such a genuine and deep concern for all its citizens.

Mr. G. I. Miller: Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to take part in the throne speech debate at the beginning of 1983. It is interesting to sit and listen to the government members trying to defend their positions and what they have done over the years, particularly the House leader when he was going over the history and how he became connected with the Conservative Party.

I would like to think that Mitch Hepburn really was the one who put hydro up and down the concessions. I remember it quite well. I believe it was 1935 when we blew out the lamp at our home and that first light bulb went on. It was like a miracle. I recall well that many good old Conservatives voted, maybe only once, but they did vote that time for Mitch Hepburn just because he was going to provide hydro to many rural areas in Ontario. I just wanted to bring the government House leader up to date.

We have been critical of Ontario Hydro's spending and I think justifiably so. When we have to start mothballing plants because of overbuilding, we have to bring some sensibility to the overall expenditures everybody has to pay for. I am not critical to the point of saying Ontario Hydro is not providing a good service, because it is. It is providing much employment.

I do not know whether we should be going totally to nuclear. The member made some interesting comments about coal-fired stations. We happen to have one in Nanticoke, which is only now getting the bugs out. It is employing 500 people. It is utilizing coal, 50 per cent of which comes from Canada. If those scrubbers were applied to that plant, it would certainly create some jobs that are badly needed. It would also clean up our environment. It would set the pace for our negotiations when we are dealing with the United States. We had our American friends sitting in the gallery today. If we set them examples, I am sure they will co-operate and follow along.

On a lighter note, I would like to bring to the House's attention that we have had some success in our hockey. All the problems and unemployment make it kind of depressing when one goes back to one's riding. It is nice to know we had a Port Dover hockey team playing Norwood.

Mr. Kolyn: Sailors?

Mr. G. I. Miller: No, juveniles. It is a fantastic

team; they play with lots of heart. I thought Norwood was in the Speaker's riding. It is pretty close to his riding. We lost out to them in a best-of-seven series, I believe it was two games to four.

The real contest we have going is the junior teams, the Dunnville Mudcats and the Lindsay Muskies. I have a little wager with my colleague the member for Victoria-Haliburton (Mr. Eakins) that the Dunnville Mudcats are going to be too much. As a matter of fact, last Sunday they threw a mudcat on the ice just to show there are real mudcats in the Grand River. I think they lead in that series three games to two.

Interjection.

Mr. G. I. Miller: There are hundreds of them in there, John. You ought to come down some time.

I would like to bring to the government's attention and just put on the record some of the facts in regard to this government and the particular economic picture in Ontario.

Figures for March show unemployment is at 569,000 or 12.6 per cent of the working force. The 1982 throne speech—and in the 1982 budget, I recall it well, the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller)—predicted an improvement in unemployment by the end of 1982 of 125,000. However, since last May we have actually seen 175,000 more people become unemployed. Present figures show 233,000 young people between the ages of 15 and 24 are out of work. This figure increased by 22,000 last month alone.

I do not know how the members on the other side of the House can be really concerned with trying to defend it, when we have unemployment rates running at that kind of figure.

In terms of the gross provincial product, Ontario is now in a position equivalent to where it was when the member for Muskoka (Mr. F. S. Miller) became Treasurer in 1977. We have fallen that quickly. Bankruptcies are at a post-war high with 3,427 firms filing for bankruptcy in 1982. One can see by that total that it certainly has added to the unemployment figure.

It was brought to my attention only last week that there are no more programs to assist small business to refinance, only through the Federal Business Development Bank. Their interest rates are 15.5 per cent. With today's economy, there is no way a small business can make that kind of profit and survive.

The throne speech did not mention the fact there was going to be assistance for small business to get some of those bankruptcies back on track again. I feel it is an area where, if the

government is really sincere, it will come up with programs. I have asked the Minister of Industry and Trade (Mr. Walker), through his good offices at Kitchener, whether there are any programs available to assist small business. I find there are none.

There is funding available, if it is in the manufacturing sector, where we will provide some assistance with a lot of strings attached. There are some programs there, but when it comes down to financing small business, there are no plans available except at the federal level, and as I indicated before, at 15.5 per cent.

I would like to compare that to agriculture and some of the programs they have. The picture for Ontario farmers is similar to that of the businessman. The young farmer of Ontario has tremendous difficulty competing for markets because of long-term loan arrangements in every other province, along with interest assistance plans. The present Ontario government lacks any real commitment to the agriculture industry in this province.

In fact, agriculture budgetary expenditures have declined from 1.83 per cent in 1971 to 1.1 per cent of our total present budgetary expenditures. This for an industry that employs one of every five people in Ontario.

A farm bankruptcy occurs in Ontario every two and a half days. Although there are many and varied reasons for this, the important thing is we need to maintain farm production.

Mr. Cooke: What does Gene Whelan say?

Mr. G. I. Miller: I will get to that. He is doing something about it.

The important thing is we need to maintain farm production to feed the people of this province and country. Ontario farms could produce most of what is needed and required in food production.

I would like to point out that in our own particular area, the Ontario Federation of Agriculture has put out a 1982 edition of Agriculture and on the front page it says, "A Major Industry in Haldimand-Norfolk," and, "Farming is a Big Business." In our region of Haldimand-Norfolk, agriculture produces \$280 million worth of crops, and of those crops tobacco produces almost 50 per cent.

10:20 p.m.

Speaking of tobacco, when we find a farming industry that is in trouble, I think the tobacco industry sets an example second to none. As a matter of fact, they had a devastating frost on August 29, 1982, I believe, which wiped out at

least 50 per cent of their crop, so this year they are negotiating for prices and markets. Because they are coming up with a production of only 210 million pounds compared to last year's 230 million, and with a short crop last year, they are not taking it sitting down; they are trying to form a national marketing agency so they can get a better share of the market in order to protect their industry.

I know some people in this House frown at the fact that tobacco is not a product that people need, but I would like to inform everyone in this Legislature that tobacco produces something like \$1.5 billion in taxes at the federal and provincial levels, plus the fact that it is about a \$500-million crop within the farming area itself. So I think it does contribute much to the overall economy of this country. The Ontario producers are competing successfully with world markets and are a leading force. They are quick to react and protect their own interests.

Mr. Cooke: What about Liberal interest rates? They have put farmers in trouble.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. G. I. Miller: Our friends to the left have asked what Gene Whelan is doing about assisting the farm industry. Again I would just like to comment briefly on the throne speech of 1982.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The member for Haldimand-Norfolk has the floor.

Mr. G. I. Miller: Getting back to the throne speech, in 1982 this government committed itself to protecting—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Now perhaps we can listen to the member for Haldimand-Norfolk.

Mr. Ruston: I will learn more listening to the member for Haldimand-Norfolk than I will from him.

Mr. Speaker: Then let's give him a chance to say it.

Mr. Cassidy: Sheila said a Liberal is a Liberal is a Liberal, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you.

Mr. G. I. Miller: Getting back to the throne speech of 1982, this government committed some assistance to the young farmers of Ontario with a lot of prodding from opposition members, but nothing really took place. They did bring in the Ontario farm adjustment assistance program, and by the end of 1982 interest rates

were down to a level where it was not very meaningful to many of the farm producers.

The only program that is available is through the Farm Credit Corp. They have a program of assisting farmers up to \$300,000 for a two-year period at 9.25 per cent. I would like to put on the record for the members to our left that some progress was made in 1982. But 1983 is a new year, and this is the throne speech we are speaking to and criticizing.

Mr. Cassidy: Forget about the past, eh?

Mr. Speaker: Never mind the interjections.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Perhaps the member for Windsor-Riverside (Mr. Cooke) would just turn his seat around a bit and face forward and listen attentively to the member for Haldimand-Norfolk.

Mr. Bradley: It is much noisier since the member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy) was moved from the front row.

Mr. Speaker: I can tell you, you are not doing badly.

Mr. G. I. Miller: Mr. Speaker, again I would like to speak about some of the bankruptcies that are taking place at the present time because I have had three of those to deal with in my own riding, as my friend the member for Kent-Elgin (Mr. McGuigan) indicated in his address just a few minutes ago.

It is not very pleasant when one is talking to a family that has been farming for three generations in one location—they have two sons who went to Ridgetown and got their training there, but one boy is sent home and told there is no future in farming, not to go back to the farm—and see those people get into a financial position that they cannot really finance because of the programs this government would not provide even with the prodding that we have given it over the last four or five years.

That is why I say in my opening remarks that this government does not really care about agriculture when it is the most important item, it is the engine that makes the economy work. As I pointed out by mentioning the booklet on Haldimand-Norfolk, agriculture is big business, and when agriculture goes, industry goes.

We have a steel plant at Nanticoke providing employment for 1,300 people and running effectively. We have a farm machinery plant at Brantford, and the member for Brantford (Mr. Gillies) is sitting here tonight. They unveiled a new tractor down here in front of the Holiday Inn only yesterday, the second tractor that has been manufactured totally in Canada.

But there is White Farm Equipment. I have people in my riding asking, "What is my future? I have worked there for six or seven years. Are they going to go back to work? Are they not going to go back to work?" They are left on a teeter-totter. We have people like that. I think that is when it gets very difficult to deal with.

As I spoke to the chap with the Massey tractor sitting in front of the Holiday Inn yesterday, he said, "If we can get the farm economy going here"—he recognizes where the needs are—"if we get the farm economy rolling again, give the farmer a fair dollar for his corn and soybeans and his wheat and his produce, he can buy that equipment and he can get that circle rolling again." That is the key. That is what we have to try to achieve.

I spoke about agriculture's engine breaking down, and it began to break down four years ago and nobody would recognize it. I do not think our friends to the left understand that. I do not think they could survive on a farm. I cannot see

anybody there who really could survive on a farm. I would challenge them to that.

Mr. Ruston: Just on the asphalt, that is all.

Mr. G. I. Miller: Asphalt farming. I am not here to defend Gene Whelan; I am here to defend the farmers I represent today, and I intend to do that.

If we do not come up with a program to refinance, if we do not get the program that has been announced in the throne speech, there are going to be a lot more sad young people out there with no place to go. They will not have a home to go to; their lifetime work will be gone; their future will be gone. We have to give them a helping hand at this particular time. That is why we have brought out a—

Mr. McLean: When was the last time you milked a cow?

Mr. G. I. Miller: This morning. When did you last milk yours?

On motion by Mr. G. I. Miller; the debate was adjourned.

The House adjourned at 10:30 p.m.

CONTENTS

Thursday, April 28, 1983

Throne speech debate

Mr. Wells.	293
Mr. McGuigan.	298
Mr. Cousens.	306
Mr. G. I. Miller.	313

Other business

Adjournment.	316
---------------------------	-----

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Boudria, D. (Prescott-Russell L)
 Bradley, J. J. (St. Catharines L)
 Cassidy, M. (Ottawa Centre NDP)
 Cooke, D. S. (Windsor-Riverside NDP)
 Cousens, D., Deputy Chairman and Acting Speaker (York Centre PC)
 Kerrio, V. G. (Niagara Falls L)
 McGuigan, J. F. (Kent-Elgin L)
 McLean, A. K. (Simcoe East PC)
 Miller, G. I. (Haldimand-Norfolk L)
 Riddell, J. K. (Huron-Middlesex L)
 Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
 Stokes, J. E. (Lake Nipigon NDP)
 Turner, Hon. J. M., Speaker (Peterborough PC)
 Wells, Hon. T. L., Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Scarborough North PC)



Hansard

Official Report of Debates

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Third Session, 32nd Parliament
Friday, April 29, 1983

Speaker: Honourable John M. Turner
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

Contents of the proceedings reported in this issue of Hansard appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of the speakers taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is \$15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, Information Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 965-2238.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Friday, April 29, 1983

The House met at 10 a.m.
Prayers.

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY

SPECIAL SERVICES AT HOME PROGRAM

Hon. Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to have the opportunity to bring the honourable members up to date on the outstanding success of the special services at home program of my ministry.

When I spoke to the standing committee on social development a year ago, I told them my ministry was initiating a program of support services and special equipment to assist parents with developmentally handicapped children to care for their children in their own homes.

I am proud to say that not only have we developed a unique program, exciting in many ways, but also we have been able to take it directly to the parents and the children. In only six months my ministry staff has consulted with the Ontario Association for the Mentally Retarded, the local associations, other agencies and interested community groups. We have developed guidelines and a manual of operation, carried out a province-wide community education program and committed \$1.5 million to this program.

To date, 870 applications for assistance have been approved. In total, 881 children and their families have been provided with services ranging from parent relief workers to specialists in behavioural management. The special services program has also provided equipment such as bath lifts, educational computers and hearing aids.

All this has led to some extremely encouraging response from the community. I might add that the media have also commended the government for providing services currently not available from any other source.

Let me give the members some examples of how this program has helped the people of this province.

In Cornwall, Peter and Nancy Amell have told us that special services at home were the key in keeping their family together. Funding to

hire a specialist to work with their three-year-old blind and quadriplegic child allowed the Amells relief from hours of constant anxiety and concern. It has also given them more time to attend to the needs of their other child.

The Rogers family in Mississauga also know the stress and tension of having a 13-year-old arthritic child who suffers from severe tuberous sclerosis, leaving her mentally disabled. This program made it possible for them to purchase a whirlpool so that the child could receive the necessary therapy and relief from discomfort in her own home.

The Edwards family in St. Catharines told a newspaper reporter that the special services program was a life-saver. It strengthened their determination to help their two-year-old son, who is blind, deaf and suffering from a rare kidney disease, to succeed in developing a future. With special indoor playground and gymnastics equipment for physical stimulation, brightly coloured to improve his visual senses, and a tiny radio-like box complete with hearing aids, Trevor now is able to explore the world around him. It has also given him the ability to distinguish voices and to develop to the level of his peers.

In Gravenhurst, doctors told the Dolmage family that their multihandicapped child would not survive infancy. That was eight years ago. Now, thanks to the special services program, a teaching assistant instructs Matthew in the use of a simple computer, and he is learning to read and communicate. He attends a school for developmentally handicapped children.

Let me emphasize, in keeping with the concept of collaboration, that the Ontario Association for the Mentally Retarded and my ministry staff have co-operated in consulting with the private sector as well as various community groups and agencies on the purchase and use of special equipment. Throughout the province, more than 200 public presentations have taken place since last October, and more than 1,000 inquiries about the program have been received.

Besides what has already been done to improve the delivery of services to children in this province, I am pleased to announce that my ministry will expand its spending to ensure that

this program continues to flourish and provide the necessary assistance for Ontario families.

The special services program provides a comprehensive range of services to assist parents of developmentally handicapped children in strengthening the natural bond of love and care with their children while in their own homes. We are showing the families of 881 developmentally handicapped children that the community admires them for the work they are doing and deeply cares.

Everyone recognizes that parents of these children have accepted the responsibilities even though it means assuming a very heavy burden. This program is a further commitment by my ministry and this government to community living for the developmentally handicapped.

TAX GRANTS FOR SENIORS

Hon. Mr. Ashe: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce to the honourable members that today the Ministry of Revenue is mailing some 554,000 interim Ontario tax grant cheques totalling nearly \$145 million to eligible senior citizens throughout the province. These cheques are combined payments of 1983—

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: Mr. Speaker, it is great that this is such an excellent program that it disturbs the members opposite to some great degree. It is only when a program is well received by the public that they get upset.

These cheques are combined payments of 1983 interim property tax grants and temporary home heating grants. The interim property tax grant portion of the cheque is calculated as 50 per cent of the senior's 1982 property tax grant, to a maximum of \$250. To that amount is added the temporary home heating grant, which this year equals \$40 per household. The maximum possible value of each cheque is therefore \$290, while the average cheque is \$260.96.

As members will be aware, the mailing of these interim cheques marks the beginning of the 1983 Ontario tax grants for seniors program cycle. In September, seniors throughout the province will receive an application form which will determine the amount of the second instalment of their 1983 grant. Seniors who turned 65 after December 31, 1982, will not be receiving the interim or first instalment of the 1983 grant. However, they will receive an application form this fall and may apply for the full 1983 grant at that time.

I would like to point out to the members that once again the mailing of these interim grant cheques is being supported by a full range of

public information measures, including advertisements in daily, weekly and ethnic newspapers and the mailing of bulletins and comprehensive information kits to all constituency offices and other key government outlets such as northern affairs offices and community information centres.

In the past these information kits have proven an important resource for staff in these offices who provide valuable support to the tax grants program through their inquiry and referral services. I know the Ministry of Revenue can rely on the continued co-operation and assistance of these offices and their staffs in the successful administration of our 1983 tax grants for seniors program.

10:10 a.m.

MEMBERS' PRIVILEGES

Mr. Sargent: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker: My point of privilege is in the interest of both myself and thousands of other Ontario citizens who are charged by an officer of the law or a court official, who go through the court system and pay their debt to society. Yet we have a Citizen Kane like Conrad Black who is above the law, who can call up the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry) and get a private appointment with him to ease the pain of—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have to ask the honourable member to resume his seat. He may question the appropriate minister during the question period.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, my rights as a citizen are being trampled on—

Mr. Speaker: All right. You are absolutely right as a citizen, but the only privileges you have the right to bring up in this House are your privileges as a member, which are over and above the privileges enjoyed by anybody else. I would have to say that you are out of order.

Mr. Sargent: I have a message I want to give to the House.

Mr. Speaker: You can give the message at a more appropriate time perhaps.

Mr. Sargent: Like when?

Mr. Speaker: During oral questions.

SEAWAY TRUST

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce that an arrangement has been made to provide for the orderly administration of the assets of Seaway Trust Co. and the payment of its liabilities as they come due.

The assets of the company have been in the possession and control of the registrar of the Loan and Trust Corporations Act since January 7. With the finalization of an agreement, the registrar will relinquish control and as of this morning, April 29, restrictions on withdrawals have been lifted for Seaway depositors except for certain depositors against whom Seaway may have legitimate claims.

Separate agreements have been reached between Seaway Trust, its subsidiary Seaway Mortgage Corp., the Midland Bank Canada, the Canada Deposit Insurance Corp. and the registrar. As a result, the effective control of Seaway Trust and Seaway Mortgage will be exercised by nominees of the Midland Bank Canada to carry out the management of Seaway's assets and the payment of its liabilities. Honourable members no doubt will recall that the assets of Seaway Mortgage have been in the possession and control of the federal government since January 7, 1983.

Under the terms of the agreements, neither Seaway Trust nor Seaway Mortgage will accept new deposits or make new investments except those incidental to the management of their assets. As the Touche Ross reports tabled in this House last week clearly indicated, the state of Seaway Trust's finances are such that the only alternative to this kind of arrangement would be the winding up and liquidation of the firm. Such action would have been detrimental to the realization on the assets, which in turn would impact negatively on depositors, creditors and shareholders. A similar situation exists in Seaway Mortgage.

As a result of this arrangement, as of today, depositors are able to receive return of their deposits or investment certificates in full as they mature or come due.

I want to emphasize that this is not a sale involving an exchange of funds. Control of Seaway Trust and its subsidiary Seaway Mortgage is being exercised by Midland Bank Canada, which will proceed to wind down the firms over about a five-year period. Seaway's staff and offices will be reduced to an appropriate level.

A five-person board of directors has been appointed, with André L. Morissette as president and chairman of the board. Mr. Morissette is currently president of Les Entreprises Pimori Inc., a Montreal-based real estate development company, and brings to his new position at Seaway a wealth of experience in the finance and banking field. The other four directors are senior officers of Midland Bank Canada.

Under the arrangements that have been made, Midland hopes to be able to reduce its own losses on a loan made by it to the numbered holding company which held the majority of the shares of Seaway Trust. The loan was secured by shares in Seaway Trust and by other assets. As a result of this relationship, Midland was seen by the registrar and the CDIC as being uniquely positioned to control and operate Seaway. Furthermore, Midland has the capacity to do so.

Midland Bank Canada is the Canadian subsidiary of the Midland Bank Group of Britain, one of the largest banking organizations in the world. The administration agreement with Midland will remain in effect as long as any deposit liabilities of Seaway remain outstanding and any amounts are still owed to CDIC.

To ensure liabilities will be met as they fall due, CDIC will provide for funds to be made available to either company as may be necessary. CDIC's financial support is based on its authority to make or guarantee loans or advances to a member deposit-taking institution when such support will reduce or avert a potential loss to CDIC.

CDIC's potential liability was made even larger by the royal assent this week of federal legislation to increase the level of deposit insurance provided from \$20,000 to \$60,000.

It should be clearly understood that under the terms of the agreements all depositors, all holders of guaranteed investment certificates and all holders of debentures other than those that have been designated will be paid in full when their security matures. Any moneys realized from the assets of the companies during the course of the agreement will be used to cover liabilities and repay as much of CDIC's advances as possible. Any surplus after such liabilities have been met will be turned over to the common and preferred shareholders. The major preferred shareholder is Midland Bank Canada.

Although the registrar is a party to some of these agreements, there are others that are made solely between the private sector parties. I am exploring with these parties the extent to which they will consent to the tabling of these agreements. I would like to provide the House with as much information as possible, and I will table copies of any of the agreements that can be publicly released.

ORAL QUESTIONS

NORCEN ENERGY RESOURCES LTD.

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, I have a question

for the Attorney General with respect to the Norcen affair. It has become obvious that there has been a great deal of confusion through public reports and in a variety of other places about the difference of opinion, apparently, between the Attorney General and the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Elgie), who has the power under, I believe, section 119 of the Securities Act to go ahead with proceedings in the matter.

Could the Attorney General explain to this House why he did not ask the minister directly for his consent to proceed with charges in this matter?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, I will repeat what I think I have said on numerous occasions in relation to this. It is our view, the view of myself and my ministry officials, that it is clear the securities legislation obviously requires the consent of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations, and for that reason there can be no doubt that there is a significant degree of prosecutorial discretion built into the legislation.

Basically, I am repeating what the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations said yesterday, because I happen to agree with his statement.

When the Leader of the Opposition refers to differences of opinion, I can assure him those differences of opinion do not exist. I think it is quite clear that the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations must give very serious consideration to the advice he gets from the Ontario Securities Commission, which I think all members of this House agree is not only an independent body but also a body made up of distinguished members of the community who are obviously dedicated to acting in the public interest.

10:20 a.m.

Our law officers were of the view that there was an evidentiary base for a prosecution under the securities legislation, and for that reason I asked the minister to have the commission reconsider its decision.

At the same time, I recognized the fact that the securities commission was in a better position than we were to make a judgement in relation to what was in the best interest of regulating the securities industry, and that, of course, would be consistent with what is the public interest.

While we had certain views with respect to

the evidentiary base, we would recognize the primary role of the securities commission to advise the minister as to how he should or should not apply the prosecutorial discretion.

As the honourable member knows, there are relatively few pieces of legislation that require the actual consent of the minister who has the responsibility for administering the act; in the Criminal Code there are several sections that require the consent of the Attorney General before a prosecution can proceed, for example.

The reason this consent is required is that it is recognized that this prosecutorial discretion has to be exercised in cases where there may be a prima facie breach of the legislation. But that in itself does not necessarily mean a prosecution will follow; it depends on the public interest.

It is quite clear to me that the securities legislation is constructed in such a way as to give the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations that responsibility, and in my view he should reject the recommendations of the Ontario Securities Commission only if there are very compelling reasons for doing so.

I saw no such compelling reasons for him to reject its advice, but I certainly thought there was reason for him to ask the commission to reconsider the matter, as it did; and I thought, given the unusual circumstances surrounding this matter, it was also in the securities commission's interest to issue some reasons, as it has done.

I think the commission has attempted to address the matter to the extent that it can—of course, bearing in mind, as we all must, that there is still a criminal investigation into this matter and that we simply have not reached any conclusions with respect to that investigation.

Mr. Peterson: Ultimately, the Attorney General is charged with the administration of justice in this province. It is obvious from the public pronouncement that he and his staff have had a different view of the situation. It is obvious that he has asked the minister to make the report public and that he has refused to do so—

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: No, I have not.

Mr. Peterson: Well, that is according to press reports. That may or may not be correct, and he can stand up in this House and deny it. But it is obvious that there is a great deal of bad faith, and even though the minister has made a decision to go no further with this matter, the Attorney General is continuing with his police

reports and continuing to cloud the reputation of people and to again—

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: You are so irresponsible.

Mr. Peterson: This is obviously the case, and there are so many economic interests at stake.

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

Mr. Peterson: I want to ask the minister about this letter that was addressed to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations, dated April 27 and signed by one Mr. Peter Dey. It says:

“Dear Dr. Elgie:

“I am writing this further letter separately from my letter dated April 26, 1983, which I have suggested be tabled in the Legislature, because this letter deals with an issue which you may wish to discuss privately with the Attorney General.

“The commission’s review of the staff report only became a matter of public information when the contents of the staff report were improperly provided to the media. The commission has questioned its own staff and it is satisfied that its staff was not the source of the information provided to the media. The commission would like to suggest to you that you request the Attorney General to initiate similar inquiries of his staff.

“The commission remains anxious to co-operate with the Attorney General in parallel investigations, but in doing so the commission must be assured that the confidentiality of its investigations is respected. The commission does not at the present time have this assurance.”

The commission does not trust the minister or what he is doing; there is obviously a bad relationship. How does he explain the hunt he is on, as opposed to the difference of opinion the commission has?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: First of all, I would be interested if the Leader of the Opposition would clarify the statement that was part of his supplementary question. He seems to be suggesting that I should direct the police to cease their criminal investigation. Is that what he is suggesting? I would like to have that clarified, because certainly that is the inference I take from his question.

He is saying that reputations are being unnecessarily clouded, notwithstanding the fact that he seems to think I should require the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations to consent to the prosecution. On one hand, he seems to be criticizing me for not making that direct request. On the other hand, he is accusing

us of unnecessarily clouding reputations. I suggest that he examine some of his own statements, examine his own conscience and determine whether he is acting in a most irresponsible fashion.

The simple fact of the matter is that I am not going to direct the police to stop their investigation. I have confidence that the Metropolitan Toronto Police will conclude its investigation when it thinks it is appropriate, and certain recommendations will be made at that time.

Despite any views the member may have on the matter, I am not going to interfere with that process. I am not going to interfere with the integrity of the administration of justice to the extent that he suggests and attempts to do on a day-to-day basis.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, relating back to the first question by the Leader of the Opposition, the main question this morning, and the introduction by the Attorney General into his answer of the term “prosecutorial discretion,” which he used a few days ago on the Metro Morning program, I want to ask the minister to clarify for me, if he can, whether he believes there is any prosecutorial discretion conferred by the Securities Act on the commission.

I also want to ask the Attorney General whether he believes the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations ever exercised any prosecutorial discretion, having regard to the very clear statement by the commission that the unanimous decision of the commission was not to recommend a prosecution under the act.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, I repeat what I have said on numerous occasions. As I read the legislation, clearly the prosecutorial discretion lies with the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations. The honourable member knows that is so. That is why the legislation requires the minister’s consent.

It is very clear that the advisory role of the commission is very important and very vital in assisting the minister in the manner in which he should exercise that very important discretion. That is clear to me and I know it is clear to the member, unless he is again playing the little games he likes to play from time to time to cloud important issues unnecessarily.

Mr. Peterson: The Attorney General chose not to address some of the very substantial questions raised in a letter from one Mr. Dey to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations which, when one cuts it all down, shows that he does not have very much faith in

the Attorney General and/or his investigation. There are selective leaks going on at various times that are in contravention of the decision the minister has made. I would ask the Attorney General to address that question.

Would the minister not agree with me that there are a myriad of questions still outstanding, such as his own role with respect to the crown attorney Mr. Johnston; his own apparent shift of position on this whole matter; his own obvious displeasure in not having full disclosure of the investigator's report of the OSC, only getting a selective report; his own opinion on this whole matter and his staff's opinion, which is different from the securities commission's?

10:30 a.m.

Given all the economic interests that are at stake here, given the reputations that are at stake, given the question of the administration of justice which has again been clouded, and the minister is well aware that again another in a long series of questions has been raised about the quality of the administration of justice in this province, surely we should have an independent probe into this whole matter to get the thing cleared up.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: With regard to the views of the Leader of the Opposition with respect to the administration of justice and independent probes, this is about the 50th time he has suggested an independent probe at the same time as there is an independent inquiry and a police investigation going on.

I wonder when he is going to come to grips with some of the basic and fundamental principles of the justice system, one of which is that we do not have public inquiries at the same time as we have police investigations. That is pretty basic to most first-year law students, at the very least. I think he might start to—

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I really think the hypocrisy the Leader of the Opposition demonstrates on a day-to-day basis in the manner in which he attempts to address these issues—he just has no respect.

Mr. Speaker: I ask the Attorney General to withdraw the use of that word “hypocrisy.”

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I will, at your request, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. I think that was a complete answer. We have spent 14 minutes on the first question.

SECURITY AT HOSPITAL FOR SICK CHILDREN

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Health. It relates to a statement he made while answering in the House yesterday.

I will quote for his ready reference: “I would report to the honourable member that all of the measures in place as of this week, before the recent incident, were substantially better and more secure than they were in March 1981. In other words, there was no relaxation from March 1981 until last Friday. Subsequent to the events of last Saturday, as a precautionary measure, some further rather extraordinary measures have been taken to increase the level of security once again.”

Last January 28, the minister will recall the Dubin report urged the creation of appropriate systems that would have required “identification of all hospital personnel and visitors.” Could the minister tell this House when those security requirements were implemented for personnel and, more important, for visitors with respect to the cardiac ward?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, with regard to all employees at the hospital, that has been in place for some time. With regard to parents and visitors in the cardiac ward, that was put in place just this past weekend as one of the extra security measures.

Mr. Peterson: Could the minister explain to this House how, as I understand it, a Canadian Broadcasting Corp. researcher gained access to the hospital yesterday? I am told the sequence of events went something like this. The person went to the cardiac ward, talked for some time with the security guard there, asked for access, had to sign his name and no identification was required.

I am told he signed his name, gave the name of a fictitious baby patient in the ward to go to visit, was granted ready access and walked about the ward. There was no one at the nursing station. He was able to look into various rooms. There was no one there attending to the various children. He meandered about for 10 minutes or so and then walked out.

I am told that happened yesterday. Is the minister aware of that? Is that the kind of security systems the minister has in place to prevent that kind of thing?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If the honourable member wants to draw certain conclusions based on that series of events to suggest that in his

opinion the security measures in place on wards 4A and 4B are inadequate, perhaps he ought to say so without making an inference, if that is the case. Let me say—

Mr. Breithaupt: That is a pretty fair conclusion.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, but I am quite prepared to say on the other side of that case that the security measures the hospital has in place, particularly on 4A and 4B, are quite sufficient. The fact that someone was down there and was able to hand in his or her name and get certain access under certain terms and conditions does not mean the security is inadequate.

It means the hospital has certain backup measures, which the member and I know should not be disclosed. It should not be taken to mean the hospital was unaware of the circumstances, that access is available to those children or that all the perceptions which he understands that particular person has are necessarily accurate.

Perceptions—the way it may appear to someone attempting to do that sort of thing—are not entirely in line with reality. The hospital knows well what is under way in 4A and 4B; and in point of fact, with regard to the recommendations they have received from the Centers for Disease Control and from Dubin regarding 4A and 4B, there is hardly anything left undone with respect to security in those particular areas as of today.

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, did I correctly understand the minister to say that the physical security measures with respect to parents and visitors as recommended by Mr. Justice Dubin were not put into effect until Saturday? If that is in fact what he said, can he explain why it took that length of time for those measures to be put into effect? Also, would the minister be prepared to present to the House some indication of the history of security measures as they have been implemented at the Hospital for Sick Children since March 1981?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Minister, you may pick any one of those three.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, may I say only that the hospital, in consultation with experts in the field, is reviewing and has been reviewing for some time the appropriate security measures to take. The fact is that up until a few days ago they had not decided to go the route of having each and every parent and each and every visitor in the hospital or in 4A and 4B get his picture taken and be tagged as he walked through the hospital. That would be a

dramatic change in the way this hospital and most hospitals in North America are run. It is partly a question of whether they are going to change the atmosphere and make the operation into one that apparently looks like an armed fortress.

A decision made in the interim on the identification of staff, that everyone who is walking around with a lab coat or a white coat of any nature in a hospital should be properly identified, has been in place for some time. The question came down to a situation of whether the one million parents and visitors who come to the hospital every year should go through the process of having their pictures taken and identification put on.

In the meantime, the hospital has adopted other security measures that they and most experts feel are adequate in the circumstances. They may want to reassess that at some stage; at the moment they and most experts in the field see no reason to reassess that decision. They are still looking at it.

In the meantime, with the circumstances of last weekend and in yet another attempt to reassure the public, they have decided for the time being to go to that particular system with regard to 4A and 4B. I think when one considers the circumstances of the hospital, the extraordinary expense all of that involves, and, more dramatically, what it would do to the whole nature of the hospital, and puts that against the extraordinary security measures they have taken in lieu of going that particular route, I think one would find that is an appropriate, reasonable and safe choice that the hospital has made.

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, there is no one in this House who does not want to restore the reputation of that hospital; we even respect the minister's right to have a secret security system and not even share the details of it with the members of this House and members of the public. But clearly it is not working: that is the point. The point is that if this researcher, unnamed, can get in and meander about, walk about the way he did yesterday, I am told, then surely that should tell the minister it is not working.

What we are asking him for are assurances that it is working; and so far, with great respect, apart from the minister's pious speeches we have not had those assurances. I am asking him now for some results, not just more speeches.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The member said clearly he has not had that assurance, and he has. He has had that assurance from me, he has had it

from the hospital and he has had it from Dubin and his people and from CDC and their people, who have said, "If you do certain things, that will be in place."

May I say, with respect, that it is a little unfortunate for the member to stand up and say he shares with everyone else the need to maintain confidence in the hospital and to have reasonable responses out there and then to go on and say in his very next sentence that clearly the security is not adequate. I wrote it down as he said it. "Clearly it is not working," he said.

The member cannot really stand there and say he wants to share and show some leadership and public responsibility in trying to maintain public confidence in the institution, and then stand up on the basis of a radio report and determine that he, as Leader of the Opposition, is prepared to say that clearly the security measures are not working.

Has the member called the hospital? Has he asked them to walk him through all the incidents that happened with regard to that particular reporter? Has he had or have his researchers had an interview with the administrator of the hospital to determine whether there is an explanation for what happened yesterday? Has he asked them whether they have backup steps in place so that they were aware of what happened? Has he done all that before he found it within his power to stand up in this House and announce to the public that the security measures are not working?

10:40 a.m.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The member has a sense of responsibility. I think he ought to discharge it.

Mr. Rae: The minister is obviously preparing for a long role in opposition with all those questions he has been asking. I wish him well.

[Later]

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I am very anxious to keep the House fully informed about any developments with regard to our continuing review to ensure safety at the Hospital for Sick Children. I am somewhat relieved to be able to report to the House that once again we have acquired the services of Dr. Hugh McDonald, who was one of the members of the Dubin inquiry, to come back and undertake what I call a "recertification" process at the Hospital for Sick Children, pursuant to the statement I made yesterday.

Dr. McDonald is the administrator of St. Paul's Hospital in Vancouver. As well as being an administrator, he is assistant clinical professor of the department of health care and epidemiology at the University of British Columbia. I anticipate and hope, having spoken with Dr. McDonald yesterday, that his analysis re certification and review might be as short as two or three weeks, presuming all goes well. Dr. McDonald expressed to me yesterday his total confidence in the Hospital for Sick Children and his desire to do anything necessary to help maintain confidence in that great institution.

EXTRA BILLING

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the same minister. It concerns extra billing.

I would like to ask him whether he stands by the remarks he made in this House on April 21 when he said, in referring to extra billing, "The benefit of it is that the better-off in society pay the freight." Later on in the exchange he said it is the rich in society who are extra-billed. Does the minister stand by those remarks?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, no doubt the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Peterson) has more judgement than the leader of the third party. He would not ask that sort of question.

Mr. McClellan: That is because he supports extra billing.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, he does. What the leader of the third party is no doubt about to do is stand up and read me a name and ask me if I am aware of Mr., Mrs. or Ms So-and-so who was asked to pay X dollars last week by physician Y in such-and-such circumstances.

As happens on Johnny Carson some nights, let me give him the answer to that question before it is asked. The answer to that question is no, I am not aware of that particular case. When the member draws it to my attention, I will take that forward.

The whole principle is as I outlined it last week. To the extent that principle is being violated by one or two of the 14,000 physicians in this province, then I should like to be aware of that and so would the Ontario Medical Association, because it is prepared to take appropriate action in that circumstance. Now, open the envelope.

Mr. Rae: Given the fact that the minister did not answer the question I put to him, I would like to put to him as a supplementary question the statements he made with respect to the better-off in society paying the freight and the

rich in society being the ones who are extra-billed and compare those with the fact that a retired Chrysler worker in Windsor by the name of Aurèle Drouillard was asked to pay—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: How did I guess?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Rae: This man has received bills. The minister can laugh at extra billing. It may be a laughing matter for him but it is not a laughing matter for Aurèle Drouillard, who has \$690 a month. It is not a laughing matter for a person on \$690 a month.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Will the member for York South please place his question?

Mr. Rae: I would simply like to ask the minister how he can put the kinds of fatuous remarks that he made a couple of days ago with respect to extra billing and the wealthy in society paying those extra bills, considering the fact that this gentleman has to pay \$600, or 65 per cent above the Ontario health insurance plan, for two operations in the past nine months to two specialists, one an ophthalmologist and one an anaesthetist?

How can he possibly justify that kind of contradiction when he makes these fatuous remarks about the wealthy having to pay, when the evidence is overwhelming in this instance and in many other instances that it is ordinary people—in this case a retired Chrysler worker who is living on \$694 net per month—who are paying the freight, and not the better-off as the minister would have us so fatuously believe?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I would not want to suggest that the member is engaging in hyperbole when he suggests that the evidence is overwhelming. What he has done is bring me one example of the 60 million services that are rendered each year through OHIP. Perhaps in the member's view that one circumstance out of more than 60 million is overwhelming evidence.

May I say that in terms of running a workable system—as I said when I spoke on this matter in the House last week and I said today, and the member's Health critic has heard me say it before—out of 60 million services, 14,000 doctors, 2,000 opted-out doctors, there are going to be some who occasionally are billing people they should not bill. The people who put that proposition know very well, or should know very well, that they ought to be calling the Ontario Medical Association through the number—

Mr. McClellan: Tell them to save their dime.

Mr. Rae: Save their money.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, of course. I may be convinced that the members opposite do need more researchers. Have the members taken a moment to call the OMA to ask how many calls it gets per month on that number? Have they? No, they have not called the OMA and asked, because they do not want the answer. The number is often used.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, does the minister not recall the commitment made by several of his predecessors that specialists would accept the Ontario health insurance plan rates in all public hospitals—at least they would guarantee that one or more specialists in each area would accept the OHIP rate? Has he abandoned that concept and can he not use that in his discussions with the OMA to ensure that the basic services are available in all public hospitals?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, Mr. Speaker, in point of fact that is what I was referring to here. Three or four years ago, after discussions with the government, the OMA put in place a toll-free number for all residents of Ontario who might call when they require or want the services of an opted-in doctor or an opted-out doctor on an opted-in basis in any public general hospital in the province. As a result, they are now getting—to save the members a phone call—200 to 300 calls per month from people who are taking them up on that service.

Mr. Nixon: The commitment was that the service would be available across the province.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They have just centralized the service so that the OMA gets the call and will then call back into that area and arrange for an opted-in doctor to undertake that activity, or in the absence of that, get an opted-out physician to provide the services at opted-in rates.

When one looks across the province one finds that fully one third of all opting out and extra billing is confined to three categories in Metropolitan Toronto. They comprise one third of all opted-out physicians. That would indicate that province-wide we do not have much of a problem and inside Metropolitan Toronto there is such a variety of alternatives that this should not present much of a barrier either. It should not present any barrier at all.

In any case, the shorter answer to the question is yes, the OMA offers that service; yes, it is used by approximately 3,000 people a year; yes,

it seems to be working well; no, I am not satisfied that it is 100 per cent effective.

Mr. Rae: The minister is just amazingly out of touch with what the reality is for a great many people who have to go to specialists in this province. That reality is that, regardless of their means and regardless of their income, they are being presented with additional bills.

How can the minister talk about universal access when the evidence shows that for anaesthetists, for example, in Grey county 100 per cent opted out; in Middlesex county, where this example comes from, 98 per cent opted out; in Nipissing 100 per cent opted out, and in Toronto-East York 100 per cent opted out?

How can the minister say the problem is simply confined to one particular area of the province when the evidence is absolutely overwhelming that with respect to several specialists all across this province they are opted out and the practice of extra billing is one that is on the increase?

The kind of justification he has given in this House for extra billing, which bears no relationship to the facts, no relationship to what is really going on in the world of this province, is only encouraging the practice and encouraging the destruction of the universal health care system in Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Might I say that the member has neglected to indicate—I do not have the figures with me, surprisingly, but I do not know how many anaesthetists there are in Grey county. How many are there? Two? Are there two?

Mr. Rae: Does it matter how many there are?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It does matter how many there are.

Mr. Speaker: Will the minister just answer the question please?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The fact is the member wants to say that 100 per cent of the anaesthetists in Grey county are opted out. I suspect there are one or two. I could be wrong. I would suggest in those circumstances the perception he wants to raise, that 100 per cent are opted out, would be perhaps more fairly presented by him if he said one or two or three anaesthetists in Grey county are all opted out, but I suspect that if I inquire—which I will do—we will discover they are very often providing their services on an opted-in basis.

The member wants to present the spectre, through glib statistics, that we have a system that is not accessible in Grey county. In point of

fact, if he wanted to be fair and balanced to present the argument, which still leaves him lots of room to manoeuvre on this issue, he would do so in that context.

Yes, there may be 100 per cent opted out in Grey county but to suggest that means there are no opted-in services rendered in anaesthesia in Grey county is, with respect, an enormous distortion and the member knows it is. He should present the case fairly.

10:50 a.m.

NORCEN ENERGY RESOURCES LTD.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I would like to return to the Attorney General on the question of Norcen Energy Resources Ltd., Conrad Black and Edward Battle with respect to the Ontario Securities Commission.

When the Attorney General reviews his association with this case from the ill-advised meeting he had in May 1982, as recorded in Hansard of December 15 with respect to the questions I raised at that time, when he takes into consideration the flurry of activity which then took place within his ministry, when he considers the efforts to have a joint investigation of the OSC and the Metropolitan Toronto Police fraud squad into this matter in an orderly way, when he asked his colleague at the last minute to allow officers from his ministry to meet with the commission in order to try to persuade the commission that there was an evidentiary case to be put and decided in the court, and finally when he culminated that by requesting publicly that the securities commission give reasons for its decision but would not join with that a request that the report of the investigation be made public, has he not now so completely compromised the police investigation into this matter that the matter should be brought to an end by him as the Attorney General?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, the simple answer to that is no, but I am not going to leave it at that. Since the member has invited me to indulge in some history, I think it would be appropriate that we do so.

First of all, as the member recalls, the original meeting with Mr. Black and his lawyers was a result of an allegation that was made that some unnamed person within the Ministry of the Attorney General was interfering directly in a very major civil lawsuit that had reached a very critical stage in Cleveland, Ohio; namely, as we all know, the lawsuit with respect to the attempted takeover of Hanna by Norcen.

The allegation was not correct, but there

were certain disturbing facts surrounding the allegation. The judge who was trying the case in Cleveland at this very critical stage of the proceedings took what I consider to be not only an unusual step but an initiative which would have been totally unacceptable in the Canadian context. He phoned a relatively junior lawyer in the Ministry of the Attorney General who, without my knowledge or indeed the knowledge of any other members of the ministry, had been advising the Metropolitan Toronto Police department.

So first of all, I have to concede that Mr. Black's solicitors might well be concerned with the fact that a judge, at a critical stage in a civil case, phoned a lawyer in another jurisdiction to make inquiries about a criminal investigation involving principals in this litigation when he was about to make findings of credibility with respect to the same principals. Obviously that is a situation which was without precedent and certainly one which would alarm any lawyers who were advising clients in these circumstances.

In my view, the meeting to deal with this issue was not ill-advised. It is true that had I or the Deputy Attorney General or the director of the criminal law division or the director of the crown law office, criminal, or the director of the crown attorneys or any of these individuals been aware there was a criminal investigation going on, the meeting would probably have taken a different format, but we would still have had to address that very serious issue of a judge in Cleveland talking to one of our lawyers about a criminal investigation just before he is going to have to make a very important decision. As history records, in the decision he made he had some rather unkind things to say about these very principals.

The ongoing police investigation was quite separate from any investigation that was being undertaken by the securities investigators. I think Mr. Dey's letter to the minister records the fact that there had been a complaint made to the commission about this which had something to do with the initiation of the investigation. I also believe that probably some of the Metropolitan Toronto Police advised the commission as well that this might be a matter that would be of interest to them.

The next flurry of activity involved decisions that were made by the director of the criminal law division, now the Deputy Solicitor General, Rod McLeod, whose integrity the member will fully appreciate is beyond reproach, and by Howard Morton as director of the crown law

office, criminal. These two gentlemen are both well known to the member for Riverdale. I am sure he would be the first to agree their integrity is beyond question and above reproach.

They made the decision—it had nothing to do with me—that more senior counsel experienced in criminal law were necessary to deal with some of the admitted complexities of this case. It is unfortunate that some rather irresponsible innuendo, to put it mildly, has been bruited about because of the change in counsel. That decision was made, as the member knows, by two—

Mr. Ruston: Time.

Mr. Conway: Four minutes.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I am sorry. I realize this question is—

Mr. Speaker: I realize the importance of it, but I think we must get on and ask the member to put a supplementary.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: In his question, the member for Riverdale has really touched on the whole history of the matter.

Mr. Speaker: I understand that, but it may be more properly dealt with through a statement if you wish.

Mr. Renwick: Is it not now true that the police role in the investigation of this matter—that is, the investigation by the Metropolitan Toronto Police fraud squad—is complete and that the matter is now in the hands of the Attorney General's ministry with respect to the questions of the advice to be given as to whether charges will or will not be laid under the Criminal Code?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: The last information I had at the beginning of the week with respect to the state of the police investigation was that it had not been concluded.

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, are there still bad relationships between the police, the Attorney General's staff and the securities commission, as evidenced in Mr. Dey's letter to the minister? What is he going to do as chief law officer of the crown to try to restore some relationships in this whole network that is charged with the administration of justice and preventing securities violations?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: First, Mr. Speaker, it is totally inaccurate to characterize the relationships between any of these bodies—my ministry, the police or the securities commission—as being bad.

Obviously the securities commission is concerned about the release of what it properly

regards as a confidential report. As the chairman has pointed out, it would be very difficult for the commission members to conduct investigations credibly in the future unless they can give the industry assurance of the confidentiality that is so critical to their investigations. Obviously they are concerned about how the report got out. Apparently they have satisfied themselves it did not happen in their own offices.

Obviously we also were concerned about how that was leaked and I have been assured by the Deputy Attorney General that he believes it could not have happened in the Ministry of the Attorney General.

11 a.m.

I am not surprised by Mr. Dey's concern about the leak of what has to be treated as a confidential document. Obviously he wonders whether somebody in our ministry or someone within the police department may have released this report. I cannot criticize him for expressing those concerns, but I can assure members of the Legislature the relationship continues to be one of a high level of mutual confidence.

Mr. Renwick: Will the Attorney General agree or undertake to review, over the weekend, the whole of the report of the investigation that was presented to the Ontario Securities Commission? And will he make a determination whether or not that report should, in the public interest, be released, bearing in mind there is nothing in that report that could possibly damage any person's reputation?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Certainly, even in advance, I would not agree to the release of that report prior to the conclusion of the criminal investigation and a decision made with respect to the possibility of charges under the Criminal Code.

HANDICAPPED EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

Mr. Wrye: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour on the handicapped employment program.

On Wednesday I acted on the invitation, which the minister extended to me and members of the resources development committee during estimates, to drop in on the handicapped employment program offices and talk with Ms. Earle and her people. The minister was right when he speculated at that time it would be quite an experience, as indeed it was.

In my two-hour meeting with a group of very

able and determined persons, working under conditions which I will generously describe as unacceptable, I found their quarters to be cramped and confined, and they were working with equipment which was both inadequate and inappropriate for their needs. It would not be overstating the case, as I am sure the minister is aware, to say in some respects the environment is hazardous to the health of some of the persons working there.

As well as lifting those physical constraints upon the handicapped employment program, it is imperative that the minister lift some of the financial constraints. A good start would be for the minister to assure us that the \$70,000, which was originally earmarked for the HEP budget for innovative research and has since been removed from it and, as he knows, integrated with the overall research budget of the ministry, will be returned to that program.

Will he give us that assurance this morning? If not, why not?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, in answering that question I can perhaps set the record straight in respect to some of the remarks that were made by the member when he first raised the question.

At that time he indicated there was a 13 per cent drop in the budget of that particular department. That was inaccurate; it was a two per cent cut and that two per cent cut was less than the total restraints placed on our ministry. In other words, we did not just cut uniformly across the board within our ministry; consideration was given to the excellent work that was being done by that department.

Also, I think it should be borne in mind that the department came into operation in 1979-80 and the actual expenditures in a relatively short period of time have increased from \$134,000 to \$625,000. The number of staff has risen from three, that is two professionals and one administrative support, to eight—six professionals and two administrative support—in that particular length of time.

In other words, that program has been growing and has been properly funded and, as I said the other day, I am totally satisfied and gratified by the dedication of the people who operate that program and the progress they have made.

As far as the actual quarters are concerned, I think those are not dissimilar to quarters occupied by civil servants throughout this government. We would love to have additional space, but we have to put up with the space we have and make the best of it.

Mr. Wrye: I feel very sorry for the civil servants of this government if they have to put up with those kinds of cramped and inadequate quarters and with very few filing cabinets.

In spite of the comments of the minister about how much more money he has put into this program, surely, with 10 per cent of the population physically disabled, what he needs is real initiative and innovation. In keeping with his policy of restraint, let me suggest to him, along these lines, a new program at minimal expense which was discussed at our meeting.

Will the minister undertake to authorize the funding and staffing for an awareness program of the possibilities and needs of the handicapped employment program among the members who sit in this Legislative Assembly?

There are 125 offices in existence throughout this province which could serve as ideal resource centres for the dissemination of information for prospective employers and employees. I have with me the kinds of information, all printed, which could be sent to our offices. We could sit down with our constituency assistants and explain it to them. Will he provide the staffing and the funding so that this program could get into the community and provide the information to our offices so we may bring it to our communities?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, I should also point out to the honourable member that in addition to the staff persons I just referred to, there is an extra professional staff person who has been seconded from elsewhere in our ministry of late in order to give additional support to the program.

In addition—and I am not actually sure of the number I am going to give, so I reserve the right to change it if it is inaccurate—this summer there will be 39 Experience '83 students working across the province on the handicapped program. This will be the largest number we have ever had on the handicapped program in summer employment. This is another indication of the importance we place on it.

I cannot disagree with anything the member says with respect to the need for attention, resources and action for the handicapped. I will match my record in the community over the years with the member's any time as far as involvement with handicapped people is concerned. I feel very strongly about that. I do not want to put down the member because he is honourable, he is decent and his concerns are genuine. I am sure the concerns he is expressing are shared by everyone in this Legislature, not only the member for Windsor-Sandwich.

He did make an express recommendation or suggestion to me. What I would like to do before I address his recommendation is receive the report I am anxiously awaiting from Jean Pigott, who has spent the past couple of years in what I think is going to be an excellent and enlightening report on the role of the handicapped.

Mr. R. F. Johnston: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the same minister, the Minister of Labour—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if, with the indulgence of the House, I might indicate—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Mr. R. F. Johnston: I note that we have eight minutes and 45 seconds left.

Mr. Speaker: New question please.

[Later]

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: Earlier today the member for Windsor-Sandwich raised the matter of the accommodation of the handicapped branch in the Ministry of Labour at 400 University Avenue. In the excitement of the debate I neglected to tell the honourable member and the rest of the Legislature that those employees in the area he described are being moved to new and certainly more comfortable and more spacious quarters within the next couple of weeks, and that has been planned for some time.

PROTECTION OF NURSING ASSISTANTS

Mr. R. F. Johnston: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Labour is aware of Thompson House, run by the Don Mills Foundation for Senior Citizens, which had 12 full-time nursing aids and 23 part-time nursing aids who are with the Service Employees' International Union Local 204. Having worked themselves up over the last few years from minimum wage before they were unionized to \$7.03 an hour, they learned on April 1 that Thompson House was going to contract out to Medox health services, a division of Drake Professional Services, which would re-employ these people at \$4.75 an hour, an amazing drop in pay. They were all advised to apply and try to get work there and basically lose all the things they had worked for over the last number of years.

Why is there no protection under the law in Ontario for those people who have worked so hard to gain the kinds of benefits they have? Will the minister bring in legislation to make

sure this does not happen to other registered nursing assistants in Ontario?

11:10 a.m.

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, with the greatest of respect, every question that is asked by the third party winds up with the question, "When are you going to bring in legislation?" My God, if we brought in all the legislation we were asked for, we would be sitting 365 days of the year, 24 hours every day.

Mr. Renwick: Not a bad idea.

Mr. Ruston: Hire another 100,000 civil servants.

Mr. Rae: Part-time Russ.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. R. F. Johnston: Imagine having to work 12 months a year, Russ. That would be terrible.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The member for Scarborough West has the floor.

Mr. R. F. Johnston: I would like to make the argument to the minister that there is a pressing need for legislation here and ask him to consider that 30 days after this decision has been made and the contracting out has taken place, the following has happened to workers who have been there for many years:

Jennis Thomas, who has worked there for 14 years, has not been called back once, although she registered with Medox; Celine Clarke, who worked there for seven to eight years, has come back for two nights of part-time work; Sally Packeri has been called for six days in total after having been there for 14 years; Cordelia Simpson, after 10 years, no time; Patricia Watson, 14 years with no time; Yvonne Johnson, nine years and has not been called back. These people have basically had all of their rights taken away, including their jobs. They were told they could come back at sort of half pay, \$4.75 an hour.

Will the minister not investigate what is going on here? Will he not pressure this firm to hire these people back? There are a number of these women here today, and I would like the minister to assure us that he will meet with them to talk about their situation and the incredible jeopardy that RNAs in Ontario feel they are in because these international hiring agencies become the only way to get employed, and at rates that are basically just above minimum wage.

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, you are probably going to cut me off for not responding directly to the question, but the leader of the third party made a comment that I simply will not accept about being "part-time Russ." I will

match my hours on this job against his at any time.

Mr. Mackenzie: Oh, come off it. That is not the issue and you know it.

Mr. Speaker: Now to the question, please.

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: In response to the honourable member's question, which is a reasonable one, certainly I will investigate; certainly I will meet with the people. May I suggest 10:30 on Monday morning in my office?

Mr. Mackenzie: Look at the cleaners over in the centre, the same thing.

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Take a look at everything you have ever asked me, you have got it.

Mr. Mackenzie: Every week we bring a case to you and nothing happens.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The member for Hamilton East (Mr. Mackenzie) will please restrain himself.

Mr. Conway: There is going to be overtime.

Mr. Speaker: Not very likely. The clocks are still running. The member for Victoria-Haliburton.

MINAKI LODGE

Mr. Eakins: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Treasurer. Even though the government has not issued a press release today, I am sure I would be remiss to let this Friday morning pass without mentioning the opening, finally, of what was described by the former minister of tourism as the jewel of the north.

I am referring to none other than our own Minaki Lodge. I say "our own" Minaki Lodge because, whether we like it or not, \$45 million of scarce taxpayer dollars have been put into this.

We are told that the room rates charged at Minaki Lodge will be \$85 per night without meals, or \$135 with meals. What this means is that its availability is restricted to fairly wealthy individuals. There may be some justification for a taxpayers' subsidy on a type of family establishment such as Ontario Place that provides recreation and entertainment for families and for some who may not otherwise be able to afford it, but to put \$45.1 million of taxpayers' dollars into a lodge that can only be enjoyed by the rich is equivalent to providing a public subsidy for the well-off.

Mr. Speaker: I assume you have a question.

Mr. Eakins: Given that this government will never recover the investment in Minaki, how does the minister justify such expenditure to the people of this province?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I would think my honourable friend, coming from a tourist area, would not throw too many stones. Either that, or his eyes are a bit green. If he checked the daily rates in any downtown Toronto hotel without meals, they are more than \$85 a day. He knows that. Those rooms are not just for the rich.

What people are visiting the lodges in Haliburton? Has he ever asked for any government assistance for a lodge in Haliburton? Are there any subsidies for the lodges in Haliburton? Of course there are, and they provide jobs for Ontario people right across the north.

Mr. Eakins: I remind the Treasurer that the resorts in Haliburton are run by private enterprise. We have no quarrel with the geographical location, but, given that the final results for 1982 will probably show the most negligible increase in this province's tourism revenues since records have been kept on this, given that this trend in our revenues has been due largely to the decrease in visitors from the United States, with preliminary figures showing some 23 per cent fewer visitors than in the previous year, and given that the main clientele at Minaki is expected to be just such visitors, in particular from the midwest United States, how can he realistically expect to see Minaki Lodge operate at a profit at some point in the near future, if ever?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Minaki may or may not make a profit, based upon the investment. There are many things that are done in remoter parts of the province that are not totally justified based on investment, but are justified upon the spinoffs that occur through the area.

The member is very learned in the resort business. It happens that the many small operations all around this province basically need attractions and/or lead hotels. That is a lead hotel. It is a world-class hotel and it will bring people into the northwest who have never known about the northwest. They will discover the smaller, family-style lodges, and they will return. We will also find benefit for the native peoples up in that area through the sport fisheries, through the jobs, through the training that is going on now that will very fully justify that basic infrastructure investment.

PETITION

RETAIL SALES TAX

Mr. Riddell: Mr. Speaker, I wish to present a petition that was organized by a grade 7 class at Robertson Memorial School in Goderich, consisting of students who wanted to exercise their

democratic rights, having discussed the democratic system in the classroom. The petition contains 317 signatures and reads as follows:

"We the undersigned feel that the sales tax on candy is too costly. We feel it should be charged per 75 cents."

Naturally, I support the petition as I have always said it was a sad day when this government chose to use the children of this province to pay for its past mistakes.

11:20 a.m.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

SOLICITORS AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. McMurtry moved, seconded by Hon. Mr. Norton, first reading of Bill 25, An Act to amend the Solicitors Act.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, the Solicitors Amendment Act, 1983, is a bill which will permit lawyers to charge the taxing officers to award interest on overdue legal bills at a more realistic rate than the five per cent rate which has been prescribed in the Solicitors Act since 1909. The bill prescribes an interest rate on overdue legal accounts which cannot exceed the prime rate. This is consistent with the rate of interest which is currently awarded under the Judicature Act for other judgements. It is also consistent with the recent divisional court decision that solicitors are entitled to the prime rate of interest from the date of judgement.

In addition, the bill provides that, for the first time, a lawyer's client will have a corresponding right to interest where upon a review of the lawyer's account it is determined that the client has overpaid his lawyer. Now it is going to be hard to vote against that.

[Later]

Mr. Philip: Mr. Speaker, perhaps you did not see me, but before the orders of the day, I had two private member's bills to introduce. May I introduce them at this time?

Mr. Speaker: Do we have unanimous consent to revert to bills?

Agreed to.

CONDOMINIUM AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Philip moved, seconded by Mr. Cassidy, first reading of Bill 26, An Act to amend the Condominium Act.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Philip: Mr. Speaker, I know the Liberals always get upset when I introduce property

bills. Property usually involves fences and they can never decide which fence they are sitting on.

This bill would repeal unproclaimed provisions of the Condominium Act that relate to the condominium bureau and instead provide for a registrar of condominiums who would give advisory services to the public, maintain a register of mailing addresses of condominiums and issue licences to condominium managers.

Condominium management would be restricted to licencees except in the case of managers of single condominiums having more than 100 units, and the Lieutenant Governor in Council would be empowered to make regulations requiring the posting of bonds.

The Association of Condominium Managers of Ontario may, with the approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council, set standards for the managers.

The bill also provides consensual procedure for the review and resolution of disputes within a condominium.

CONDOMINIUM AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Philip moved, seconded by Mr. Cassidy, first reading of Bill 27, An Act to amend the Condominium Act.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Philip: Mr. Speaker, the bill would authorize condominium corporations to make bylaws providing for the collection of special levies from owners of residential units that are occupied by tenants.

CONSTITUTIONAL PROPERTY RIGHTS

Mr. Renwick: Before the orders of the day, I would like to draw to the attention of the government House leader, who I hope was here, standing order 26(c) dealing with statements by the ministry. It says, "After any policy statement the minister shall table a compendium of background information."

On Thursday, April 21, the Premier (Mr. Davis) stated that he was pleased to advise the House that the government of the province will introduce in the near future a resolution to authorize from Ontario's standpoint, an amendment of the Canadian Constitution regarding property rights. I would assume that is a policy statement, and I would ask the government to table or provide us with a compendium of background information, either now or at the time the resolution is actually introduced into the assembly.

MOTION TO SET ASIDE ORDINARY BUSINESS

Mr. Renwick moved, seconded by Mr. Stokes, that pursuant to standing order 34(a), the ordinary business of the House be set aside to discuss a matter of urgent public importance, namely, the role of the Attorney General and the Ontario Securities Commission in the investigation of alleged breaches of the Securities Act and the Criminal Code by Norcen Energy Resources Ltd., Conrad M. Black and Edward G. Battle in relation to trading in securities.

Mr. Speaker: I would like to advise all honourable members that the motion under standing order 34(a) to set aside the ordinary business of the House has been received in order and in time. I ask the honourable member to explain why he thinks the ordinary business of the House should be set aside to hear this.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, briefly, with respect to the question of the urgency of this matter, I am not going to speak on the question of its public importance. It is obviously a matter of serious public concern, but the question of urgency is the matter that will justify this motion being accepted for the debate to proceed.

I need not say that in any comments I make I am not making any reflection on the personal integrity of any of the people who may have been involved in any of the matters that are brought before the assembly.

My first point on the question of urgency is that I have brought this motion at the earliest possible opportunity following the decision of the commission not to prosecute under section 118 of the Securities Act. It could not have been brought in on an earlier occasion because an opportunity had to be given to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Elgie), to the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry) and to the Ontario Securities Commission to respond to the serious concerns raised by the decision of the commission to close its file on April 13.

The commission's jurisdiction in this matter is now entirely at an end. It is urgently necessary because the integrity of the procedures, and I emphasize the integrity of the procedures, of the commission is in question. The commission has failed completely to abide by the code of due process and fair proceeding laid down in section 11 of the Securities Act.

This section is a mandate by this assembly to that commission of the way in which investigations are to be conducted with respect to the procedures to be followed when considering the

laying of charges under the Securities Act or, indeed, under the Criminal Code. That procedure was not followed in carrying out this most serious investigation and decision, and must be debated immediately; otherwise, the commission and its reputation will continue to suffer.

11:30 a.m.

It is significantly urgent that the matter be now debated, because in portions of the decision of the commission that were placed before the assembly yesterday by the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations, there was no reflection in the decision of the commission of whether it accepted the evidence that was before it.

The commission members went off on an esoteric discussion of the questions of material fact and material change, which are of course germane to the question, but they did not reflect in their decision whether they accepted the documentary and other evidence that was in front of them or whether they accepted the denials of that documentary evidence that took place in some of the statements that were before the commission. In my view, these are matters of great concern.

My last point is that in the real world, not in the world in which these matters now are being discussed, for practical purposes the matter is at an end. The earliest opportunity must be taken to debate it here in this assembly. When I say the matter is at an end, I am referring not only to the fact that the commission is finished but also to the fact that for all practical purposes the police investigation has come to an end and the decision of the Attorney General has been reached, and it is urgent that these matters now be considered.

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion of my friend the member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick). As he has pursued this matter from the beginning, he has demonstrated nothing but judgement and fairness all along.

This whole matter has raised a number of very serious questions that at this point have not been resolved in anyone's mind. It has to be put in the context of the whole question of the administration of justice, the whole method the Attorney General uses in a sense of almost holding people hostage, be it Susan Nelles, be it Mr. Proverbs, be it some of what I consider the indiscreet behaviour of him and his ministry, and the political nature of the whole Attorney General's operation here.

I accept the suggestion from the member for Riverdale, although I did not know it myself, that the police investigation is to all intents and purposes finished and is only requiring a judgement from the crown attorneys and/or the Attorney General ultimately. We face the spectre that these charges are still going on, the investigation is still going on, and we are playing very fast and loose with a number of people's reputations and with the economic interests of very many people.

I do not know how anyone in this situation—and for the purpose of my argument I equate Neil Proverbs and Conrad Black as being in identical positions—can fight back against an Attorney General who is so cavalier in the way he handles some of these matters. It is not just one piece of evidence; there are a number of pieces of evidence to support the concerns I have felt about this whole matter.

In England, I understand, the Attorney General does not even sit in the cabinet. That is one position that is supposed to be above politics. Yet there are so many suggestions here of political influences at various different times along the way and so much confusion in this matter with respect to his position and the position of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations, who has ultimate authority in this matter.

I do not think anyone should accept the suggestion for a minute that the opposition has ever attacked the integrity of the securities commissioners. That has never been the issue; and even though the minister would wrap himself in that cloak or in some sacred principle about not letting the reports go public, those are not the issues.

I refer the minister to section 15 of his own act, which says, "Where an investigation has been made under section 11, the commission may, and, where an investigation has been made under section 13, the person making the investigation shall report the result thereof, including the evidence, findings, comments and recommendations, to the minister, and the minister may cause the report to be published in whole or in part in such manner as he considers proper."

The minister has statutory authority to make that report public. He has chosen to make some parts of it public. It is no secret. He has seen it, we have seen it and a lot of other people have seen it. Again, with the selective release of certain bits of information, I suggest both ministers are complicitous in tainting the reputation of the administration of justice. The

minister would not believe the number of calls I get on these issues asking why one group in society is treated differently from another group, and I cannot explain it.

I think there are a number of unanswered questions here. The Attorney General said in the House today that there is an evidentiary base, whatever that means—grounds to lay charges, presumably. He has not been able to persuade his colleague that there are grounds for charges to be laid. There is still the outstanding question of the role of Mr. Johnston, who was summarily dismissed some time ago as the crown attorney leading the investigation into this matter.

I think it is time now, on the basis of this, to have a wholly new look. We could start shedding some light on the question by having a debate today, and I would hope it would result in a probe of this whole matter as well as a new look at the securities legislation in the future, including a look at the conflict of interest rules.

It is very difficult in this situation, when we have commissioners, not to have conflicts of interest; I recognize that, and I am aware of some of the jurisprudence on the issue. But I think that as of this point it has not been fully aired to anyone's satisfaction. The minister has the authority to let that report go; I think it is reasonable in the circumstances. Let us commence that discussion today by a thorough airing, as suggested by my colleague the member for Riverdale.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, it was certainly our view until a few moments ago that the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations would represent the government in a brief submission, but in view of the unfortunate aspersions that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Peterson) insists on hurling at a lot of people who are associated with the administration of justice in this province, I feel compelled to respond at least in brief.

We on the government side oppose the emergency debate at this time. We do not believe there is an emergency. This matter has been debated for some months and will continue to be debated, and in view of the fact that there is an ongoing criminal investigation, it certainly would not be in anybody's interest.

I think the commission, in coming forward with a very lengthy letter from its distinguished chairman, has made every reasonable effort to explain its decision in the very unusual circumstances surrounding all the history of this unhappy affair.

But I want to say to the Leader of the Opposition that he has the colossal gall to talk about being free and easy with people's reputations, yet almost on a day-to-day basis he makes snide comments and cheap innuendoes about a lot of very distinguished people who serve with me in the Ministry of the Attorney General. I really think he should be ashamed of his conduct in this Legislature.

A lot of people who used to have some regard for him, who have known him over the years, are a little concerned about the cheap shots he feels compelled to make on a day-to-day basis because of his sense of what the role of the Leader of the Opposition should be. He seems to think innuendo that attacks directly the integrity of a number of people is part of his role as Leader of the Opposition. He is behaving in a very shameful fashion, and he should be bloody well ashamed of himself.

The very difficult decisions that are made in the Ministry of the Attorney General with respect to the administration of justice are decisions that not only are shared but, in virtually every case, also are concurred in by all the senior members of the ministry.

11:40 a.m.

Obviously this is not the first time, because I am aware of the cheap shots that come from the member's office on a day-to-day basis. He wants to reduce every public issue to a trivial matter of petty political partisanship. In doing so, it is one thing to criticize the individual Attorney General; we are in a political arena and we do have some understanding of the process. But I want to say on this occasion that his remarks go far beyond criticizing me personally. On a day-to-day basis, he is attacking the integrity of a lot of people, many of whom he knows well and knows are totally committed to—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: Is it my understanding that this debate is one that ranges over any subject the Attorney General may be interested in?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Who introduced Neil Proverbs?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I am just saying there is a clear motion before the House and I would ask you to use your prerogative to insist that the Attorney General stick to that subject and no other.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Who was it who started talking about Neil Proverbs and Susan Nelles?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Nixon: You are out of order. Why are we listening to this drivel? It is out of order.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: We know what happened to you.

Mr. Nixon: It will happen to everybody sooner or later, and your turn is coming up.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Perhaps we could just let our emotions subside and address the issue at hand, the motion which the member for Riverdale has put forward.

Mr. Nixon: Do you want the debate or not?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Who was it who started to introduce these other issues into the debate?

Mr. Speaker: With all respect, I do not think that is at all important.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: The former and present leaders should know what has happened to the Liberal Party by insisting on sort of getting into the gutter on these issues instead of just—

Mr. McClellan: Now that we have passed the "Yah, yah" stage—

Mr. Cooke: Throw him out.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Would the Attorney General please address the motion?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: The member knows exactly where he is at and where he has been for some years. The fact of the matter is that the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations and ourselves—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I ask you to insist that the Attorney General withdraw his remarks, which are completely unacceptable in this chamber or elsewhere.

Mr. Speaker: Please—

Mr. Nixon: He said we are in the gutter and he knows we know where we are at.

Mr. Speaker: I did not hear him say that.

Mr. Nixon: Why should he be allowed to talk that way?

Mr. Speaker: Order. Will the honourable member—

Mr. Nixon: He is a disgrace to the democratic

process and to the responsibility of law and order.

Hon. Mr. Wells: You people are pitiful.

Mr. Speaker: Will the Attorney General address the motion, please?

Mr. Sargent: Tell us why you are protecting Conrad Black.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: This is an example of what I am talking about, the level at which these people want to debate these important public issues. The Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations and I will continue to address these difficult issues in the public interest. Certainly it is quite clear from the attitude we have heard in the past few moments that an emergency debate at this time would serve no useful purpose.

Mr. Conway: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: I understand the passions this debate involves. I was quickly perusing Beauchesne, and of course he sets out over four or five pages many of the words and phrases that constitute unparliamentary language.

I ask the chair to reflect upon some of what we have heard here. I personally believe such phrases as "in the gutter" and "innuendo" are by any reading of Beauchesne or anything else clearly unparliamentary, and I ask the chair at least to reflect upon that and perhaps give us some direction.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you for drawing that to my attention. However, with all respect, I did not hear the use of the phrase "in the gutter."

Mr. Kerrio: Out of the side of his mouth.

An hon. member: Perhaps you will check into it.

Mr. Speaker: I will indeed. Thank you.

Mr. Sargent: If you have enough money, you don't go to jail.

Mr. Kolyn: You're still out.

Mr. Sargent: At least I am paying my fine and I am doing my chore and I am not driving my car. As far as I am concerned, you guys don't have the guts to put Conrad Black in jail.

Mr. Speaker: Would the member for Grey-Bruce please resume his seat?

Mr. Sargent: They make me sick over there.

Mr. Speaker: This surely must be Friday.

An hon. member: It's the clock.

Mr. Speaker: Indeed it is, and that may be a persuasive argument to follow the recommendation of the member for Sudbury (Mr. Gordon).

Quite obviously I have listened with great

interest to the submission put forward by the member for Riverdale and to why other members think there should be and should not be a debate proceeded with under standing order 34(a). It is an important issue and one that obviously has raised a lot of public concern and public interest.

Somewhat reluctantly, I must say that in my opinion the matter does not properly fall within the limits of standing order 34 and I therefore rule that the debate will not proceed.

Mr. McClellan: Are you going to explain, Mr. Speaker, why it does not fall within the purview of the standing order?

Mr. Speaker: It is an interpretation and it falls within standing order 34(c)(i): "The matter proposed for discussion must relate to a genuine emergency, calling for immediate and urgent consideration."

In my opinion, this matter does not constitute an emergency in as much as it has been before the public for many months. It has been raised in this House on numerous occasions. It has been a matter of great discussion in all the media for a very prolonged period. That is what I base my opinion on and I stand by that opinion.

Mr. Sargent: You should read the paper some time.

Mr. Speaker: I do.

Mr. McClellan: Very reluctantly, sir, I have to challenge your ruling.

12:15 p.m.

The House divided on the Speaker's ruling, which was sustained on the following vote:

Ayes

Andrewes, Barlow, Birch, Cousens, Cureatz, Davis, Dean, Drea, Elgie, Fish, Gillies, Gregory, Grossman, Kennedy, Kolyn, Lane, Leluk, MacQuarrie, McCaffrey, McCague, McLean, McNeil, Miller, F. S., Mitchell, Norton, Pollock, Ramsay, Robinson, Rotenberg, Scrivener, Sheppard, Sterling, Stevenson, Timbrell, Treleaven, Villeneuve, Walker, Watson, Wells, Williams, Wiseman.

Nays

Allen, Bradley, Breithaupt, Bryden, Cassidy, Charlton, Conway, Cooke, Cunningham, Di Santo, Eakins, Elston, Grande, Haggerty, Johnston, R. F., Kerrio, Mackenzie, McClellan, McGuigan, Miller, G. I., Newman, Nixon, Peterson, Philip, Rae, Renwick, Ruprecht, Ruston, Sargent, Stokes, Worton, Wrye.

Ayes 41; nays 32.

MEMBER'S WEDDING ANNIVERSARY

Mr. Speaker: Before proceeding with the regular business of the House and before all the members vacate, I think we should all note the fact that the member for Essex North (Mr. Ruston) and his wife are celebrating their 40th wedding anniversary on Sunday, May 1, and they would be very happy to receive you between the hours of two and five or six and eight. Have a great weekend.

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, on that subject, I think Hansard should also note that they are still both very happy.

Mr. Speaker: The half that is here looks extremely happy.

12:20 p.m.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(continued)

Resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

Mr. G. I. Miller: Mr. Speaker, it was nice to recognize my colleague the member for Essex North (Mr. Ruston) on his 40th wedding anniversary. Forty years is a long while, and it does add a little colour to the Legislature. After some of these difficult debates we have, it is nice to have something on the lighter side.

As I was winding up last evening I was trying to make some points about agriculture and the dire straits we find many of our farmers in, and some points also on behalf of small business, pointing out the fact that 3,427 firms filed for bankruptcy in 1982. I was trying to encourage this government through the throne speech debate to bring out some programs they had promised for the last two years, particularly for agriculture and small business, to give some assistance to those industries, which are so important in our province.

Another point I would like to make concerns the unemployment among our young people. There are 233,000 of them from 15 to 24 years old, and our area is no exception. Last year many of our young people who often get summer jobs were not able to do so because of the early frost and the cutback in the work that was available.

I would just like to bring to the attention of the House the fact that the provincial funding for the youth employment program has fallen

from \$58.80 per unemployed youth in 1980-81 to \$45.28 in 1982-83, a 23 per cent decrease even discounting inflation. The Experience '83 programs have been announced and those programs are being cut back again this year.

At a time when unemployment is running higher, that is an area this government can take a look at. It was one of our issues when the restraint program was brought in last September through Bill 179, that this money should be set aside and utilized to get the young people and our economy going. We estimated at the time that some \$400 million to \$800 million could be saved through the restraint bill; if the money were used to provide incentives to hire young people or by subsidizing them, as the government is doing at the present time, it certainly would get our young people taking part in the overall work programs of our province.

Another issue that was brought out in the 1982 throne speech was that they were going to encourage and develop our port facilities in the province, but I have not seen very much evidence of that to this point. Again localizing and looking at our own particular area, we have Dunnville, which is situated on the Grand River with a natural deep-water port to provide a good seaway facility. I notice that in Toronto they are redeveloping the waterfront and removing those elevators. It seems to me it would only be a good stimulation to develop a port along Lake Erie that is capable of taking deep-sea boats.

We do have a strong agricultural base, and it could be stronger if the province were to take some leadership in developing the land at South Cayuga and Haldimand and in encouraging farm production in that area. It certainly has not reached its potential. Again, it would stimulate that part of Ontario and utilize our waterways.

With respect to the development of the Nanticoke industrial area, there is pressure being applied to Port Dover now to provide more port facilities at Nanticoke. It is probably one of the largest and it handles the most tonnage of perhaps any port on the Great Lakes with the exception of Thunder Bay and the Lakehead. Now that Stelco is utilizing its steel plant, Texaco is exporting oil from the Nanticoke generating station and the Hydro plant itself is importing many millions of tons of coal every year it is becoming a very busy port.

Last year's throne speech promised that there would be future development and these are areas we certainly could take a look at, along with developing some minor recreation ports

like Turkey Point, Sandusk and Nanticoke Creek, because there is room for development there. I would certainly encourage this government to take a look at those projects to see if we cannot improve those facilities.

The last two areas of concern are to ask this government, when we are talking about small business and trying to get our economy moving again, whether it would take a specific look at our small towns. Again using some examples like Jarvis, Dunnville, Caledonia and Simcoe, we have a lot of vacant plants. There is one in Dunnville that was working for Essex International of Canada Ltd. three or four years ago making car lighting harnesses. It went out of business. That plant has been sitting there for the last three or four years now, and it is a good facility. The Minister of Industry and Trade (Mr. Walker) should be looking at that to develop some use for it.

We had a canning plant in Waterford. Granted, it was an old pickle plant that had been owned by Canadian Cannery Ltd., which closed down last year. But perhaps it could be upgraded by the so-called Board of Industrial Leadership and Development program, which has been useful to my area and many areas of Ontario. We are the heartland of the pickle and cucumber industry. Now with no facilities there the produce is going to have to be trucked to other locations and it is going to put a damper on the expansion of that program, although we have all the tools to produce and grow in that direction.

12:30 p.m.

In this year's throne speech there was an indication that the government was going to promote and encourage development in regard to the foreign auto industry. If they want to produce, 85 per cent of those cars should be produced in Canada. We have an excellent location at the Townsend industrial park to handle those facilities in that area. We also have the potential to provide the housing.

That gets back to the fact that this government has spent and invested great sums of money in Townsend, including the water system that is capable of not only servicing that area but has within its scope to service Kitchener and the heartland of the Grand River. At a time when we are looking for work programs, it makes good sense to me that the water line be extended along the Grand River to Caledonia, Brantford and Kitchener, providing a good source of excellent water. In return, it would provide

more runoff water to make better quality water in the Grand River itself.

What is the member looking at over there?

Mr. Treleven: Just the quality of your water.

Mr. G. I. Miller: It is Lake Ontario water. This is after it comes down and is diluted at the Niagara River and Toronto gets the results.

I spoke about the industrial area and the potential we have to develop housing in that part of Ontario.

One other area I would like to bring to the attention of the government is the fact that we do have Townsend. Going back to its history, John White indicated we were going to have a growth of nearly one million people and there was a need for those town sites, South Cayuga and Townsend. This has not really come about. The population of the region has changed by only a couple of thousand people since the inception of regional government in 1973.

We have always tried to be reasonable and promote our own municipalities, indicating to the government we should let the existing towns develop and then, when the pressure comes on, bring in the new town sites. The government, in its wisdom, did not pay attention to our criticism and our views. It moved ahead with Townsend.

There are about 100 homes there now. They have fixed it up to be a beautiful location, but it has been very expensive and it has been at the expense of communities like Jarvis, where we have now had a subdivision for six to seven years. The hydro services are there, the lots are there, the streets are paved and they are not being utilized.

If one moves into Port Dover the same thing happens, only with 250 lots and they are selling slowly. Simcoe is another example where there are hundreds of lots and potential to grow; they are just sitting there, but they are not moving.

In Townsend itself, it is only because of extreme sales pressure by the Ontario Land Corp. and the fact it has access to considerably more funds than the private developer has that they are able to promote those homes. They are certainly good homes, providing homes for our young people. I am not opposed to that but I think the same thing should apply to the private developer to get the other lots, which are serviced and ready to go, on to the market.

The program brought about in 1982 was successful. I think Caledonia was a good example. We were able to take advantage of that program and have perhaps developed more homes in the municipality than any other area. I

think we have to bring in another program that will keep the home program viable, because the spinoff effect is tremendous. I guess the bottom line is it has to be at a price we can afford.

There is one other area which was mentioned in the throne speech, and that was that insurance benefits, workers' benefits were going to be reviewed. It is about time a close look is taken at the retirement funds so that they are portable. This has been a project of my leader.

It has come to my attention only within the last few days that one of my constituents who had worked at a firm within my area died after 27 years at the plant. His widow is going to receive a pension of \$198.77. She is getting a portion of the Canada pension. Her total take is \$406. If he had lived to age 65, he would have received \$1,097 a month.

She is not capable of going out to work. She has raised her family. When the breadwinner is not there, how we can expect her to keep her home, live in it and keep it up on a pension of about \$4,000 a year? It is almost impossible.

The husband had earned that pension but, just because of the unfortunate timing of his death, the family is not able to take advantage of that. It is an area we have to zero in on. I want to bring it to the attention of the government and hope that something can be done in the near future about that problem.

I will conclude my comments. These are the areas of my concerns. I know we are in very difficult financial times. Unemployment is running high. Our caucus and I want to support any program that will get the economy going and give our young people a share of the action that is so important to the future of Ontario and Canada.

Mr. MacQuarrie: Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to participate in this debate. I would like to point out that on the same day as the Lieutenant Governor was delivering the speech from the throne a rather unique trade fair was taking place in Chicago. This fair was called Robots 7 and involved 200 companies with a total sales force of some 30,000 people. These companies had but one objective, which was to sell the articulated arms and the infrared recognition systems that will be standard equipment in the factories of tomorrow.

They were selling more than technologies. They were selling ideas and they were selling the future. It is that future and Ontario's place in it, as suggested by the throne speech, that I want to talk about today. I want to talk about it

because it is not only of interest to the people of Ontario but it is of particular interest to me, the people of Carleton East and others in the Ottawa area, who see and hear of parts of that future evolving around them every day at places like the National Research Council and other government laboratories, the universities and laboratories of the high-technology firms in the Ottawa Valley.

Before I talk about that future, it is a privilege for me to represent the great riding of Carleton East and the fine people who reside in it. The riding, as you know, Mr. Speaker, is the largest riding in eastern Ontario and the fourth largest in the province in population.

12:40 p.m.

Within its limits it contains the national aeronautic establishment of the National Research Council, which possesses some of the most sophisticated wind tunnel equipment and facilities in the world. It also possesses the Montreal Road campus of the National Research Council, which is engaged in research and development across the whole spectrum of scientific and technical knowledge. In addition, it possesses the laboratories of the geomagnetic section of the federal Department of Energy, Mines and Resources and the land engineering and test establishment of the Department of National Defence. Consequently, we are interested in high technology.

I would like to talk about the future, because it is the one thing which, to an extent, we can direct. In a world of exploding change, there is no question that we must be prepared to change and to change rapidly in order to maintain our future in as prosperous and rewarding a state as our past. I want to do what I can to ensure that this government's progressive policies and programs will help to shape a better future for Ontario. The technology of production is shifting to hard and soft automated systems. The shift is taking place at the moment and will continue at an even faster rate in the future.

The sad fact is that many of our industries are technological dinosaurs. Many of them are now involved in playing catch-up with their international competitors. At risk is the viability of our traditional industrial base and the jobs that depend on it. The automobile industry, so important to the economy of our province, is one of these industries. Currently, there are 25,000 robots at work in Japanese industry, and in the United States there are approximately 5,000 to 10,000 industrial robots, including 2,400 in the auto plants.

Mr. R. F. Johnston: What about the legislative robots?

Mr. MacQuarrie: Most of the robots I see are across the way.

The American auto makers plan to increase the size of their robot work force to between 15,000 and 25,000 by the end of the decade. That is according to an article in *Business Week* on March 28. It costs between \$15 and \$18 an hour to maintain the average auto worker. A six-axis, servo-controlled, computer-driven robot amortized over eight years costs between \$4 and \$5 an hour. More significant, the cost of operating robots will probably decline to the \$1-to-\$2 range by 1990.

Mr. McClellan: What kind of car does a robot drive?

Mr. R. F. Johnston: We need rules to make sure robots don't drive Japanese cars.

Mr. MacQuarrie: Judging from the remarks from across the way, I think the cost will go to even less.

In Canada, we have a grand total of 200 industrial robots. Of this total, 115 are at work for the Big Three auto makers, who are now attempting to modernize their production facilities and to increase the number of robots in their systems to approximately 450 by 1985. This in itself will not be enough to guarantee the long-term viability of the industry unless we supplement it in the short term by other measures.

This government's proposals in the speech from the throne with respect to quota and Canadian-content regulations should be adopted and put into effect by the federal government to give our domestic industry—

Mr. McClellan: You should give this speech in Oshawa.

Mr. MacQuarrie: Surely in Oshawa, they are realists; or are they?

Mr. Kolyn: We will find out in five years whether we have any.

Mr. Grande: Keep on reading, you will do well.

Mr. Nixon: I wish you guys would leave him alone.

Mr. McClellan: I wonder if they have robots that read speeches.

Mr. MacQuarrie: I have one other speed—slower.

It is essential that the regulations with respect to quota and Canadian content be adopted and put into effect by the federal government to give our domestic industry a chance to re-establish

itself and put itself in a position to compete effectively in any market.

Firm trends suggest that in the future the most efficient and productive industries will be built around soft automated systems. These systems combine basic robots, specialized computers, numerically-controlled machines, all in a super-flexible manufacturing system.

It is interesting to note that the National Research Council is in the process of establishing a flexible manufacturing cell in its mechanical engineering division. It is also interesting to note that today, I understand, a group from our Ontario Centre for Robotics and from our Ontario Centre for Computer-Aided Design and Computer-Aided Manufacturing are visiting the National Research Council.

These new systems will set the world's standard in efficiency, product quality and cost. It is against these standards and these industries that we in Ontario must compete.

This government recognizes that fact and accepts the challenge. As the Premier (Mr. Davis) said at the opening of the Ontario Centre for Microelectronics, to compete in today's international markets means going up against the very best in the world and winning; winning in terms of quality and winning in terms of costs. There is really only one way to win and that is through superior technology.

The Science Council of Canada has issued a report which confirms the Premier's view. According to the Science Council of Canada, research and development of superior technology is the key to the survival of our manufacturing sector, to improving our competitiveness in world markets and ultimately to raising our standard of living.

To its credit, the Canadian federal government in its recent budget introduced a number of measures to support technological research and development. These measures include the construction of 15 technology centres across the country.

What will be Ontario's position in this world of the new industrial revolution? Looking at that future through the window provided by the speech from the throne, I see a general outline of that future and detect in the speech a genuine commitment on the part of this government to improving our economic prospects through investment in and development of high technology.

12:50 p.m.

I am confident that the details and specifics of the policies and programs in the throne speech

will be filled in by the provincial budget and by the policy statements which will be made by the ministers of this government. I would hope that at that time what I perceive to be a number of inadequacies in our current policy approach in the area of high technology and the transfer of that technology will be dealt with. The programs we have in place are excellent but do not address some problems which, if left unresolved, could jeopardize what we have achieved to this point and what we hope to accomplish in the future.

In an area as novel and dynamic as high technology, a program cannot be totally comprehensive. New problems will arise as our high-technology sectors develop. As our experience in managing this area grows, we will discover that some approaches are better than others in relating to specific problems. High technology is, after all, more than chips, computers and robots. High technology embraces a broad spectrum of scientific and technical disciplines. Programs that prove effective for the development and diffusion of technologies in one sector may prove to be less effective in another.

In addressing some of the points raised in the throne speech, I will make a number of recommendations as to how we might more effectively deal with the opportunities before us. In most cases these proposals could be seen as supplements to existing programs. All of them, in my opinion, will enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of current initiatives. In many instances, I am sure, I am anticipating the minister. However, I bring these forward for the consideration of all members.

It is my strong belief that if the economic recovery which seems to be building is to be anything more than an intermission between recessions, we must quickly and systematically exploit high technology. In the speech from the throne, this government undertakes to help build internationally competitive industries in Ontario. To realize this goal we will have to ensure that our industries have made available to them the high-technology hardware and software they will need to compete.

To accomplish this we must help build a viable high-technology sector in Ontario. We must then concentrate not only on technology transfer but also on domestic research and development. We must maintain this dual focus, because in Ontario and in Canada generally we have two problems. Our first problem is inadequate research and development. In 1983, spend-

ing on research and development by the private and public sectors will increase by some 12 per cent. In spite of this increase we will still be spending less than one per cent of our gross national product on research and development. This will have to improve.

Our second problem is that Canadian firms have proved to be extremely slow to adapt what are known as "best-practice technologies" in their operations. A recent study by the Economic Council of Canada shows that it is usually five years, and sometimes more than 10 years, after the first use of an innovative technology that the technology is picked up and applied by a Canadian firm. This is the case even for technologies developed in Canada.

The Ontario technology centres supported by the Board of Industrial Leadership and Development should help us overcome the problem of technological lag in our traditional industries. Our resource industries in particular stand to benefit because mining and forestry companies which have been hard hit by the recession have reduced their spending on research and have cut back on their research staffs. The technology centres will no doubt play an important role in our efforts to build internationally competitive industries. However, I think the following points should be borne in mind:

First, the centres should give special emphasis to the transfer of domestic technologies without neglecting offshore technologies that we can use to advantage. Currently it is estimated that 75 per cent of the technologies that come out of Canadian universities go abroad instead of into our domestic market. Technologies developed by other sources in Canada are also often developed offshore.

By way of illustration, a group in the photo-

grammetric section of the National Research Council several years ago devised some revolutionary techniques. Were these techniques developed or exploited in Canada? No. They were picked up, developed and exploited by the Swiss and the Italians.

Another illustration concerns an electronics engineer, a space engineer, who was involved in the Telesat project. As part of his employment he went down to the Mojave Desert, where he discovered, in the motel where he was staying, water of the most pure and excellent quality. In looking into it he found that the water was produced and purified by means of a technology known as reverse osmosis, membrane technology or ultra-filtration. Having an entrepreneurial mind, he inquired as to where this technology originated. He found that the source of the technology and the leading expert in the field, was back in his own home town.

This is the type of thing that cannot be permitted to happen. We cannot expect to build a strong high-technology sector when a lot of our potential flees the country in search of development.

Second, unless we step up our own research and development efforts we will become increasingly dependent on those nations that do invest in basic research. Instead of innovation we will have importation; we will be perpetually one step behind our competitors in the development, application and export of technologies. Our technology centres will in this case only help our industries keep up with yesterday.

I notice that the time is one o'clock.

On motion by Mr. MacQuarrie, the debate was adjourned.

The House adjourned at 1 p.m.

CONTENTS

Friday, April 29, 1983

Statements by the ministry

Ashe, Hon. G. L., Minister of Revenue:	
Tax grants for seniors	322
Drea, Hon. F., Minister of Community and Social Services:	
Special services at home program	321
Elgie, Hon. R. G., Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations:	
Seaway Trust	322

Oral questions

Grossman, Hon. L. S., Minister of Health:	
Security at Hospital for Sick Children , Mr. Peterson, Mr. Rae.	326
Extra billing , Mr. Rae, Mr. Nixon.	328
McMurtry, Hon. R. R., Attorney General:	
Norcen Energy Resources Ltd. , Mr. Peterson, Mr. Renwick.	323
Norcen Energy Resources Ltd. , Mr. Renwick, Mr. Peterson.	330
Miller, Hon. F. S., Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics:	
Minaki Lodge , Mr. Eakins.	334
Ramsay, Hon. R. H., Minister of Labour:	
Handicapped employment program , Mr. Wrye.	332
Protection of nursing assistants , Mr. R. F. Johnston.	333

Petition

Retail sales tax , Mr. Riddell, tabled.	335
--	-----

First readings

Solicitors Amendment Act , Bill 25, Mr. McMurtry, agreed to.	335
Condominium Amendment Act , Bill 26, Mr. Philip, agreed to.	335
Condominium Amendment Act , Bill 27, Mr. Philip, agreed to.	336

Private member's motion

Motion to set aside ordinary business , Mr. Renwick, Mr. Peterson, Mr. McMurtry, negatived	336
---	-----

Throne speech debate

Mr. G. I. Miller	340
Mr. MacQuarrie	342

Other business

Members' privileges , Mr. Sargent.	322
Constitutional property rights , Mr. Renwick.	336
Member's wedding anniversary , Mr. Speaker.	340
Adjournment	345

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Ashe, Hon. G. L., Minister of Revenue (Durham West PC)
Breithaupt, J. R. (Kitchener L)
Conway, S. G. (Renfrew North L)
Cooke, D. S. (Windsor-Riverside NDP)
Drea, Hon. F., Minister of Community and Social Services (Scarborough Centre PC)
Eakins, J. F. (Victoria-Haliburton L)
Elgie, Hon. R. G., Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (York East PC)
Grande, T. (Oakwood NDP)
Grossman, Hon. L. S., Minister of Health (St. Andrew-St. Patrick PC)
Johnston, R. F. (Scarborough West NDP)
Kerrio, V. G. (Niagara Falls L)
Kolyn, A. (Lakeshore PC)
MacQuarrie, R. W. (Carleton East PC)
McClellan, R. A. (Bellwoods NDP)
McMurtry, Hon. R. R., Attorney General (Eglinton PC)
Miller, Hon. F. S., Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics (Muskoka PC)
Miller, G. I. (Haldimand-Norfolk L)
Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
Peterson, D. R. (London Centre L)
Rae, R. K. (York South NDP)
Ramsay, Hon. R. H., Minister of Labour (Sault Ste. Marie PC)
Renwick, J. A. (Riverdale NDP)
Ruprecht, T. (Parkdale L)
Sargent, E. C. (Grey-Bruce L)
Treleaven, R. L. (Oxford PC)
Turner, Hon. J. M., Speaker (Peterborough PC)
Wells, Hon. T. L., Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Scarborough North PC)
Wrye, W. M. (Windsor-Sandwich L)



Hansard

Official Report of Debates

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Third Session, 32nd Parliament
Monday, May 2, 1983,

Speaker: Honourable John M. Turner
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

Contents of the proceedings reported in this issue of Hansard appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of the speakers taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is \$15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, Information Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 965-2238.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Monday, May 2, 1983

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

LEGISLATIVE PAGES

Mr. Speaker: Just before embarking on the routine proceedings I would ask all members of the Legislature to join with me in recognizing the following new pages, who are beginning their first day of service:

Carrie Aitken, Parkdale; Paula Albinson, Frontenac-Addington; Lisa Barry, Sudbury East; Kelly Ann Cook, Stormont-Dundas-Glengarry; Shirley Couchie, Nipissing; Robert Donovan, Fort William; Scott Geddes, Peterborough; Garfield Gilson, Rainy River; Renée Girard, Cochrane North; Michael Kennedy, York South;

Joshua Laughren, Nickel Belt; Lisa Livingstone, Etobicoke; Peter Manga, Ottawa West; Tanya McKinnell, Brant-Oxford-Norfolk; Sean Morley, Oakville; Scot Rutherford, Scarborough-Ellesmere; Cristopher Shepherd, Windsor-Walkerville; Donald Somerville, York Mills; David Taylor, Simcoe Centre; Michelle Timmerman, Wellington-Dufferin-Peel; Carolee Osborne, Wellington South, and Barbara Williams, Oriole.

I would ask you to join with me in welcoming the new pages.

ARTICLE IN NEWSPAPER

Mr. Kerrio: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker: I rise to correct the record regarding a newspaper article in the Sunday Sun on May 1. There was a remark in an article by Claire Hoy that was attributed to me. I will not go into the details; I do not want to add any credibility to the story by outlining the details.

I would like to say to the House and to those who are interested in the article that I did not make the statement that was attributed to me, and I hope this gentleman would have enough dignity to withdraw or make some kind of apology to the member.

STATEMENT BY THE MINISTRY

ACCESS TO GOVERNMENT FACILITIES

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: Mr. Speaker, the need to offer every single citizen of our province the opportunity to visit all of the public buildings

across Ontario has been of the highest priority to this government and my ministry.

The member for Windsor-Sandwich (Mr. Wrye) rose on a point of privilege last week with respect to access by the physically handicapped to this historic building from the promenade and garden area opposite the main entrance.

I would like to take this opportunity not only to answer the honourable member's question but also to bring this House up to date on the many initiatives we have taken to ensure access to government facilities by the handicapped, not only at Queen's Park but across the province.

Over the past number of years, we have been adapting our existing buildings to ensure accessibility in virtually every corner of Ontario. Ramps, electric doors, sloping curbs and special parking areas are only a few of the changes we have undertaken to make certain all the people of Ontario have access to their government facilities.

To help co-ordinate these efforts, the Ministry of Government Services has set up a barrier-free design office. This office will assist with a one-window approach to address the needs of the physically disabled as well as those of our client ministries.

Our design expert, who is himself a paraplegic, will work with community associations for the handicapped. He will provide technical advice and design in this special area of expertise and we will be keeping an up-to-date record of new developments in this field.

In all of our new buildings, such as the Macdonald-Cartier Building in Kingston, the Ontario government Ministry of Revenue building in Oshawa and the Newmarket courthouse, we have addressed the need for physically handicapped access during the design stage, as we will in all future government buildings across Ontario.

I am pleased to say we will presently be making modifications to the area mentioned by the member to ensure wheelchair access from the promenade to the parking area adjacent to the front door.

However, with respect to providing access at the far southern portion of the sidewalk, we do not feel it prudent to encourage those people in wheelchairs to negotiate the heavy traffic flow

on Queen's Park Crescent and University Avenue by requesting the city of Toronto to install a sloping curb.

There are no stop signs, crosswalks or traffic lights at this location. It would be far safer not only for the handicapped but for all citizens to utilize the Wellesley Street crossing. However, the improved access area will certainly allow people in wheelchairs to enjoy the garden and promenade area.

The House might also be interested in knowing precisely what we have done in and around this chamber to facilitate usage by the handicapped.

We have access ramps located at both the north and main entrances. There is a special elevator for the handicapped located behind the main staircase. All washrooms have been redesigned to accommodate the disabled visiting our east, west and basement areas. Water fountains have been installed. We will continue to make further improvements in the future.

I believe, and I am sure every member of this Legislature feels the same way, that we must continue to do everything in our power to guarantee citizens with physical disabilities the same opportunity as all other Ontario citizens to meet their elected representatives and government officials.

We will continue to make changes and improvements to guarantee this right at every opportunity, and I certainly welcome any suggestions and ideas from the honourable members towards our constant desire to achieve these goals.

2:10 p.m.

VISITORS

Mr. Speaker: Just before proceeding, I would ask all honourable members of the assembly to join me in recognizing and welcoming in the Speaker's gallery Mr. Robert McEwen, chairman of the United States section of the International Joint Commission, and Mr. Blair Seaborn, chairman of the Canada section of the International Joint Commission.

ORAL QUESTIONS

WEILER REPORT

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour arising from the observations of Professor Weiler contained in his second report on the subject of workers' disability and workers' compensation. While acknowledging that the Ontario Workers' Com-

pensation Act is one of the best in Canada in dealing with occupational cancer, Professor Weiler goes on to present a litany of horror and grief with respect to a number of occupational cancer fatalities among workers.

He says, "Less than one out of 17 occupational cancer fatalities predicted by the conservative end of the scientific debate" receives compensation from the board. He then goes on to say, "Another way of putting it is that 650 workers (or their surviving dependants) who fall victim to occupational cancer each year are being deprived of \$150 million in benefits which the law has promised them." Surely this is unacceptable to the minister, and I want to ask him his timetable for introducing reform to the current law to correct this very serious inequity.

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, I share the concerns and sentiments expressed by the Leader of the Opposition. We had been awaiting that report by Professor Weiler for some time. We did try to expedite it so that it would be available for the current hearings on the report, which started last Tuesday, and we were successful in getting it in time for that. Copies were circulated on Friday of this past week.

Meanwhile, there is one statement I would like to clarify, if I may. It was reported in the newspaper this morning that only 40 out of 700 work-related cancer fatalities are compensated each year by Ontario's Workers' Compensation Board. If the member would look at page 24 of Professor Weiler's report and the figures he has cited, that represents the potential number of work-related cancers in Ontario. The actual occupational cancer claims received by the WCB number less than 100 in any given year, and of those 40 received compensation. So it is actually 40 out of approximately 100, rather than 40 out of 700; but if there is only one, as far as I am concerned that is still an unacceptable level.

In response to the question the Leader of the Opposition asked about the timetable, the hearings, as I mentioned a moment ago, recommenced last Tuesday. They will continue for at least three more weeks and, during that period, it is planned to have Professor Weiler in attendance to answer questions to provide further information to the committee members. Then we will await, with considerable interest, the report of the committee. From that point on, we will try to deal as expeditiously as possible with changes to the legislation.

Mr. Peterson: I am sure the minister is aware that the original report was filed in November

1980, almost three years ago, and we are now only starting discussions at the legislative level. Surely there are some recommendations the minister could deal with on an interim basis. I refer him, for example, to recommendation 2.4 in the report, which I quote:

"An important issue at the intersection of the WCB, the ministry and the safety associations is the collection and analysis of data on industrial accidents. In effect, the board serves as the eyes and ears of the province on the size and distribution of the occupational injury problem. However, serious deficiencies exist in the current collection and transmission of this data, especially to the extent that either the ministry or particular associations wish to use it to better understand the causes and reduce the incidence of accidents."

What Professor Weiler is strongly implying is that the current co-ordination process in the ministry for detection and prevention is wholly inadequate. Surely that is something the ministry could move on immediately, rather than waiting for the results of the discussions, which may take some time.

Would the minister at least agree to moving immediately on some of these measures to make sure we do not wait any longer than we already have?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Without going into great detail, I would indicate that I believe we are already doing just that.

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, Professor Weiler makes it very clear that one of the main problems as to why the board has not received more cancer-related claims—the minister mentioned the number 95 in his answer to the leader of the Liberal Party—is that the board has turned down so many claims, workers have been discouraged and doctors have been discouraged. That is the reason the board is not receiving the number of claims with respect to industrial disease that it should be.

I would like to ask the minister specifically, does he not recognize that he can, together with the Workers' Compensation Board, change the policy guidelines with respect to the recognition of industrial diseases so that we do not have to wait for changes in legislation? Does the minister not realize it is something which can be done right now so those workers and those families who are left out in the cold by decisions of the board, and by nondecisions of the board, will receive compensation starting tomorrow if the minister decides he can move to change the guidelines?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, the third party has three very capable, dedicated and concerned members on the standing committee on resources development that is studying the Weiler report at the present time. They are making their voices heard and we are listening to what they have to say. I am sure their advice and their input into the final report will prove to be very constructive.

Mr. Wrye: Mr. Speaker, surely the minister understands it would be wrong in a sense to muddy the waters of the current committee hearings, which are really to look at the first report of Weiler and at the level of benefits, and to study whether we are going to have some changes in procedures.

While I acknowledge this new report does deal with some of the recommendations which flowed out of the first report, surely the minister must understand there are things he can do now without waiting for the legislative committee to act. I want to refer him to one thing, and that is recommendation 1.3 in which Professor Weiler says:

"The single most important legislative/administrative reform must be the creation of an Industrial Disease Standards Panel (IDSP) which will be charged with the primary responsibility for developing criteria for evaluating disease claims."

The minister knows he has proposed who the panel members would be and he has proposed far-reaching powers for them. Will the minister give us his timetable for acting on this recommendation? Will he give us his first indication that he will approve this recommendation?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, I am not in a position today to give any timetable, but I want to agree with what the honourable member has said in that I do not expect the resources development committee, in the study on the Weiler report, to deal with part 2 as well as part 1.

There is some relationship there and I would expect it to deal with those related parts, just as the member has pointed out. However, there are other matters there which my ministry, in concert with the Workers' Compensation Board, will have to deal with and we fully intend to do so.

SUNCOR EARNINGS

Mr. Peterson: If the Treasurer is through hugging the governor (Mr. Bernier), I would like to ask him a question.

Mr. Breithaupt: He just wants an invitation to Minaki. That is all he wants. He wants to see where his money is going.

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

Mr. Peterson: I obviously caught them in an embarrassing position, Mr. Speaker.

I have a question for the Treasurer. He is travelling about the province setting people up for a nasty budget, implying there will be increases in Ontario health insurance plan premiums, implying there will be major increases—

2:20 p.m.

Interjections.

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, could you contain him? He is so excited about that hug, he cannot—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Peterson: The Treasurer is travelling about setting people up for a nasty budget, implying there will be higher OHIP premiums, higher taxes, probably a higher deficit and a variety of other things.

Has the Treasurer done a calculation, and is he going to share with the people of this province his calculation, with respect to the costs to the taxpayers of this province of holding the one-quarter interest in Suncor shares for the first five quarters we have had it? Has he done that calculation to figure out how much net out of pocket as of this point it has cost people in this province in the first year and a quarter, ex the dividends, ex the increase in equity, laid against the interest costs payable directly out of pocket by the taxpayers?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I was hugging the governor. It was probably a \$2-million hug, I would guess. He usually needs those kinds of moneys.

I want to say one thing about the governor, if that is what one would call him: no one in the history of this province has done as much for northern Ontario or has made the people there as loyal to our government as that gentleman.

Mr. Laughren: Oh, nonsense.

Mr. Speaker: Now for the question, please.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, was I stretching the rules?

Mr. Speaker: Yes.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Sorry.

Mr. Martel: No one has given as much away.

Mr. Breithaupt: No one has done as well out of it, either.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Back to the question, please.

Mr. Martel: Are you looking for a vote or a delegate?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I am in my blue suit today. The truth is my friend who likes to have John Turner come to his fund-raising dinners and pretends he is a Liberal one night—

Interjections.

Hon. F. S. Miller: We knew no one would come if it were just the member's dinner, so John had to go.

Mr. Speaker: I do not think this has anything to do with the question. I point out to all members we have used 12 minutes of question period and I ask the Treasurer to respond to the question please.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I was just using that as they do, as an introduction to my comments.

What I was going to say is that it is intriguing to me that he can complain about us buying 25 per cent of an oil company when the party he was espousing that night bought 100 per cent of two companies for a price at least double market value. We negotiated long and hard for what was then a fair market price. The estimates will show the true cost.

Mr. Peterson: Because the Treasurer perhaps does not know the answer to the question, I can assist him with the answer.

The reality is the 1982 earnings for Suncor were some \$60 million, the 1983 first-quarter earnings were \$22.7 million; total earnings were about \$82 million, and the government's share was about \$20 million. The 1982 interest was \$93 million and the first quarter of 1983 interest was about \$23 million for \$116 million.

Would the Treasurer not agree with me that the net cost out of pocket to the taxpayers of this province for the joy of ownership of a one-quarter interest in Suncor has been \$95 million. That is what it has cost us out of pocket to own those shares. Would the Treasurer not agree with that?

Second, would the Treasurer not agree with me that the \$95 million would have been far better spent on, for example, the youth employment program he has cut back and underfunded by \$50 million? Would he not agree it would have been better spent on the Ontario home renewal program which was cut back and underfunded?

Mr. Speaker: Order. I think I pointed out to all honourable members at the beginning of the

session that each member would be allowed one question. I quite clearly heard your question. The Treasurer will respond.

Hon. F. S. Miller: My colleague is quick to try to assess immediate returns against immediate investment. I would suggest if he went through the investments made by Noranda and MacMillan Bloedel in 1982, and investments by hundreds of companies in 1981, and then looked at 1982, he could come up with figures like that.

Without a doubt, 1982 was one of the worst years for economic return on investment in Canada. Many a company had a loss last year. Does that mean there was not value in the assets of the company? Does that mean the basic investment in that company was not sound? I do not believe so.

Mr. Peterson: Would the Treasurer not agree with me that the \$95 million which the taxpayers are out of pocket represents an amount similar to a five per cent increase in Ontario health insurance plan premiums, which he may attempt to impose on us? Would he not agree also that it represents in total a \$50-million cutback in youth employment programs, an \$11-million cutback in Ontario home renewal programs, the tile drainage loan program underfunded by \$20 million, the young farmers' program not implemented for \$11 million? All of those together would add up to roughly what it has cost the taxpayers out of pocket for the joy of owning those shares in Suncor.

Would the Treasurer not agree with me now that he was right a year and a quarter ago when he protested but did not have the clout to prevent that process?

Would he not agree with me that he should start the process of trying to realize a maximum gain by disposing of those assets, because it will continue to bleed the taxpayers for a long time into the future?

Mr. Sweeney: It's the oil version of Minaki.

Hon. F. S. Miller: If it is the oil version of Minaki, we ought to be proud of it.

The proof of the pudding will be in the eating. I would suggest to the member that I, for one, have never tried to defend that investment—I do not believe the Premier (Mr. Davis) has very often—on the basis of immediate financial return. As a matter of fact, there are seldom times in history when governments can justify an investment in a corporation, at least from this government's point of view, for the dollars returned on investment. There has to be a secondary, political reason.

The secondary, political reason—there were three or four of them in this case—was what effect that would have on Ontario's position and right to have a place at the table to discuss the pricing and supply of oil in this country. The member knows that was part of a coherent Ontario policy enunciated in 1979.

WEILER REPORT

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, I would like to go back to the Minister of Labour about the report of Professor Weiler and the problem of industrial disease. I am sure the minister is aware that the criteria established by the board to decide whether to recognize a particular claim for cancer are internally generated criteria, and the policy guidelines are internally generated policy guidelines.

Given the pretty devastating criticism which Professor Weiler levels at the approach the board has taken and the impact this approach has had on rejecting a number of claims and on discouraging other workers from launching their own claims, does the minister not feel this is something he and the board itself can work on immediately?

Does the minister not see that it is not necessary to wait for the never-never report of the standing committee but it is something that can happen today with respect to people whose claims are being denied today and families who are being left out in the cold today? Does he not recognize the urgency of the problem?

Mr. Riddell: It's a never-never report because your colleagues wouldn't sit.

Mr. Rae: No, you wouldn't sit.

Mr. Riddell: Oh, you've got to be out of your mind.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Riddell: You're stupider than I thought you were. It was the Tories who wouldn't sit. You guys are right out of your heads.

Ms. Copps: You guys are the only ones who can afford to go to Florida.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, I believe I answered that in the first round of questions, where I stated rather clearly, I thought, that Professor Weiler's second report does not have to wait for the report of the committee. There are many things in there that can be looked at right away, and I assure the members of this

House they will be considered as quickly as possible.

2:30 p.m.

Mr. Rae: With respect to the second major aspect of Professor Weiler's report, the need to develop a universal social insurance scheme that will cover people injured at work, at home and on the road, can the minister tell us what his position and the position of his government is with respect to that proposal, given the number of people in this province who are not covered by workers' compensation, who are not covered by public schemes and not covered by private schemes, and who are literally left out in the cold after suffering a serious disability? Can he tell us what the position of his government is with respect to that major proposal by Professor Weiler?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, I first had the opportunity to read Professor Weiler's second report on a plane going back to Sault Ste. Marie on the weekend and on a plane coming from Sault Ste. Marie on the weekend, and I do not really want to be presumptuous at this time and make any statement that I might regret later.

I have to look at it in more depth. I have to discuss it with my senior officials. It is a very complex report. It is very enlightening. It has some dramatic departures from the current system. It is one that required a great deal of study and a great deal of contemplation, and again I commit myself to trying to do that as quickly as possible.

Mr. Wrye: Mr. Speaker, I want to return to the ongoing problem of our committee's deliberations, and the minister in his response to a question I asked earlier noted correctly that there is some interrelationship between this first and second report.

Can we have a commitment from this minister and from the Ministry of Labour that before the committee meets with Professor Weiler at the end of May we will have in our hands as a committee the initial response of the ministry in all of those areas that may overlap in our considerations?

To mention just one, there are the new changes that Professor Weiler has proposed with respect to experience rating in his second report, where he has gone much further, it seems to me, than the recommendation in the white paper and in the draft legislation. Can we have the ministry's views on the changes that Professor Weiler is now proposing?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, I would truly and sincerely wish to be able to answer in the affirmative to that question, but I really do not think I can. I do not think it is something we can address, with all the other demands this month, in that quick a period of time; nor would it be appropriate to answer that quickly. This is a very important matter and one we are going to have to look at very seriously.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, since only three regulated substances deal with cancer, it would seem the only way to reduce the possibility of workers being exposed to toxic substances that are carcinogenic is for the minister and his ministry to move to ensure (a) that all new toxic substances are pre-market tested; and (b), that all labelling of materials would give the generic names, the chemical composition and the hazardous effects on workers exposed to those substances.

Will he move to do this so that workers will know what they are working with and thus put pressure on companies to test adequately to guarantee that we reduce the horrendous number of cancer cases from occupational disease?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, the answer to that is yes. I believe we are working towards that objective.

EXTENDICARE LTD.

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the Provincial Secretary for Social Development in the absence of the Minister of Health (Mr. Grossman) and the Premier (Mr. Davis).

Wakey, wakey, Margaret.

An hon. member: She will vote her own way, Dennis.

Mr. Rae: That's right. She will do whatever she wants to do, Dennis. Just because she is sitting next to you does not mean you can count on her.

I am sure the minister is aware of the agreement that was announced on Friday between the Queensway Hospital and Extendicare Ltd., which has been described as a trend-setting agreement that will give that private-profit institution, Extendicare, a very major stake in the operation of a chronic care unit at that hospital.

Is the minister prepared to table the agreement with Extendicare? And can she please explain to this House why taxpayers and seniors are being asked to pour money for 20 years

down the throats of private-profit medicine in the field of chronic care?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the signing of the agreement, but I would ask the honourable member to pose his questions directly to the Minister of Health.

Mr. Rae: The minister is in Switzerland; I cannot very well ask him there. The provincial secretary is here and in the House and she does have a responsibility for the overall social field. This is clearly a very important element in the social policy of this government: the privatization of much of our public hospitals.

I would like to ask the minister a very basic policy question. Given the agreement with AMI (Canada) Ltd. in Hawkesbury and given this agreement here in Toronto with Extendicare, is it now the policy of the government of Ontario that private-profit medicine will be asked and encouraged to come into this province to run hospitals at a profit?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: No.

Mr. McClellan: Mr. Speaker, would the provincial secretary be so kind as to find out from her colleague, when he gets back from his visit to the gnomes, whether she can obtain the information with respect to the ministry's share of the capital financing of this project, which I understand to be \$2.2 million out of \$6.5 million?

Would she tell us what the likely profit picture will be for Extendicare over the course of the mortgage on this facility and what return will there be to the taxpayers of Ontario other than the opportunity to pay a minimum \$15-per-day user charge if they have to go to this chronic care facility? What other kind of benefit will there be to the taxpayers of Ontario?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Mr. Speaker, when the minister returns next week I am sure he will be prepared to give a full statement on the agreement that was signed with the hospital.

BUY CANADIAN POLICY

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Peterson) asked me a number of questions last Tuesday with respect to the purchase of a computer manufactured in the United States.

I have looked into the matter and I find that the Ontario Manpower Commission prepared a specification for a total system, part of which was a requirement for computer hardware. In accordance with established practice, the commission invited four Canadian companies to bid on the specification. These four companies

responded with bids for the total system ranging from approximately \$57,000 on the low end to over \$200,000 at the high end.

The contract was awarded to the Canadian company that submitted the lowest bid. The Canadian company, in order to meet the terms and conditions of the specifications, supplied as part of the total package a hardware component manufactured by a California computer company. I have been advised by my staff that there is not at present a Canadian company that manufactures equipment that meets the commission's requirements.

The member also asked that I table the specifications, the bids received and the analysis of the bids made by staff with regard to this purchase. I will provide him with a copy of the specifications. It is not, however, government practice to make public the proprietary information regarding pricing structures contained in confidential bids. I cannot, therefore, table the bids received or the analysis of those bids.

I would note for the member that the commission has not received any complaints regarding this purchase. In accordance with the government's policy on competitive purchasing the ministry would, if requested, provide unsuccessful bidders with information on the name of the successful bidder, the bid price and the reasons for nonselection. The ministry stands ready to debrief any vendor who wishes to discuss any bid. Two of the unsuccessful bidders in this purchase have already discussed their bids with the Ontario Manpower Commission.

2:40 p.m.

I have been assured by staff that the computer purchase at the Ontario Manpower Commission was carried out in a fair and equitable manner. The allegations that the commission is experiencing technical problems with this equipment and that it is not performing are not true. The equipment is operating satisfactorily and there are no problems either with the equipment or with the supplier.

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, since it is obvious that the Canadian company was acting as a broker and presumably the minister did not specify Canadian machinery in his tendering documents or in the specifications he tabled, why are we told that Nabu, a Canadian corporation, a multinational with some thousands of employees in Canada, produces comparable models here? I am told they could be applied here, yet the company was not given the chance

to tender. Why would that be in these circumstances?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Obviously, the member and I are getting different reports or different pieces of information. I can only reiterate what I said in my comments.

I would add that I did ask my staff to review the Canadian content of the four submissions. That review indicates that the successful bidder had the highest Canadian content. The next lowest bid was inferior in terms of Canadian content and was also incomplete.

DEATHS AT HOSPITAL FOR SICK CHILDREN

Ms. Copps: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Solicitor General. The minister is no doubt aware that the Centre of Forensic Sciences has completed its preliminary investigation into the Murphy death and that Dr. Hastreiter is already reviewing the results with a member of the team from the Atlanta Centers for Disease Control. Can the minister comment on confirmations by hospital officials that the police have already informally told them that homicide has been ruled out?

Hon. G. W. Taylor: I have no knowledge of what the member has said in regard to comments made to hospital staff by the individuals she has mentioned.

Ms. Copps: When the minister does receive information and when a homicide is ruled out, will he guarantee that a coroner's inquest will be called immediately, despite the fact that there is at present a backlog of two or three months, as indicated by the coroner's office today? Will he guarantee that a coroner's inquest will be called into the Murphy baby's death immediately, if and when he receives information that homicide has been ruled out?

Hon. G. W. Taylor: If this is a situation that warrants a coroner's inquest, I will accommodate the member and call for an immediate inquest if one is recommended by the chief coroner.

EXTRA BILLING

Mr. McClellan: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Provincial Secretary for Social Development in the continuing absence of the Minister of Health (Mr. Grossman).

I will quote briefly from the minister's statement to this House on February 14, "Until the time arrives at which the member can stand up, not with statistics but with a real case where

accessibility to medicare has been threatened by a doctor refusing to treat someone unless they pay an extra-billed amount which they were unable to pay, then we do not have a problem with accessibility."

Has the minister had an opportunity to read about the simply appalling case in today's Toronto Star? It is the case of a five-year-old child born with a deformed upper jaw who requires facial surgery and who has been unable to obtain it because her father already owes the doctor an outstanding bill of \$2,100. The doctor will not perform the rest of the surgery until the bill is paid. Further, the compound interest on the outstanding bill will probably add up to \$10,000 by the time the amount is paid off. How can this kind of case possibly happen in a province that is supposed to have a universal medicare program?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Mr. Speaker, I have not had the advantage of reading that story in the Star today, but I will certainly ask the deputy minister to give me a report and report back to the House tomorrow.

Mr. McClellan: I had an opportunity to do a little informal survey of my own constituents. Out of 150 respondents, 50 had experienced extra billing. That is about one third. A number of them were extra billed in amounts over \$100.

On Friday the Minister of Health said five per cent of claims are submitted on an extra-billed basis. That is three million claims a year, in case the minister cannot divide.

Does the provincial secretary agree with the words of the minister on Friday that we have no problem in this province with extra billing and even less of a problem here in Metro? Does she agree with that when we have the kinds of cases such as the one on the front page of the newspapers again today and three million extra billing cases a year in this province?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: As I recall the Minister of Health's comments on that specific topic, I do not recall him saying we had no problem. I think he indicated with the large numbers of claims that go through we do have a minimum number of problems, but in any large system it is almost impossible to have a perfect count. Even with one case, as the member points out today, I am sure the minister will be most anxious to have that one looked into to find out exactly what the problems are.

FOREIGN INVESTMENT REVIEW AGENCY

Mr. Sweeney: Mr. Speaker, I have a question

of the Minister of Industry and Trade. While the minister is returning to his seat, I would comment that I had this question all last week for the Premier (Mr. Davis) but he was not here Monday, he was not here on Friday, he is not here today, and on Tuesday and Thursday he left after 20 minutes. One would think he has other things on his mind these days.

Mr. Speaker: Question please.

Mr. Sweeney: The question is to the Minister of Industry and Trade as the Premier's stand-in.

On February 21, the Minister of Industry and Trade for Ontario, in a meeting in Ottawa with other ministers of industry, and I would assume the federal minister, recommended that all those firms that have fewer than 600 employees, or less than a \$15-million gross, be exempted from the Foreign Investment Review Agency applications.

Since this would represent 85 per cent of all of the applications that come before FIRA, their own office has said they might just as well go out of business. Yet only seven days later, in Paris, France, the Premier of this province is reported thus: "Mr. Davis defended the Foreign Investment Review Agency. He insisted some review was necessary for a country with such a high penetration of foreign control."

One has to wonder who speaks for Ontario with respect to FIRA? Does Ontario have a policy with respect to FIRA?

Hon. Mr. Walker: Mr. Speaker, let me remind the member that in this particular case he has failed to read the accurate information and has read only the story that was reported in the newspaper. Had he read the documentation which I think was sent to his office, I think he would have realized that the position I advanced was somewhat different from what he is now suggesting.

The position I put forward was a prenotification procedure whereby if an application fell within a threshold, in other words it was a below a certain threshold, in this case a \$15-million threshold, in that particular case the Foreign Investment Review Agency would be notified. If the matter was considered to be in any way sensitive, FIRA would immediately contact the party and advise that it wished to have a full and complete application. If on the other hand it was not deemed to be particularly sensitive, and if no reply were received within 30 days, then the company would be deemed to be appropriate under the circumstances and considered

allowed to go forward with its particular acquisition.

It is called the prenotification procedure. It has been something of a position advanced now by the Canadian Bar Association, a position we have adopted within the province to speed up the process of FIRA, which has to some extent been slowed down in the past.

I will say there has been a speedup over the past year that has been substantial. It has not had anything to do with me. It has had nothing to do with me. It has had something to do with Mr. Lumley, who has brought in a new machinery that has advanced the process a great deal.

The particular procedure, that I advanced to them in conjunction with the recommendation of the Canadian Bar Association, would go a long way to cleaning up the morass of the Foreign Investment Review Agency, which as the member knows approves 95 per cent of the applications anyway. This would be a process that would speed it up. It would be worth while and it is deemed by most people to be appropriate. Almost all of the trade and industry ministers present that day agreed and supported the point put forward.

2:50 p.m.

Mr. Sweeney: Our understanding from talking to people in Ottawa is that they are substantially moving in that direction anyway. There is nothing new in that process.

Given the fact that Ontario is invited to comment on any application coming before FIRA which affects the interests of Ontario or an industry that might locate in Ontario, and using the Premier's words in terms of "penetration of foreign control"—and we not talking only of investment, we are talking of control—I would like to know how far this minister and the Premier are prepared to allow further penetration of foreign control?

As an alternative, how far are they prepared to assist small Canadian-owned businesses currently operating in Ontario to expand to fulfil the role that foreign control now fulfils or wishes to fulfil?

Hon. Mr. Walker: We are prepared to encourage as much investment as we can that is for the betterment of the public in creating jobs within the province. That is the first position. Any particular application that comes forward will be very carefully considered by us and encouraged as much as possible. We are more interested in the corporate behaviour of industries while here than in what their parentage may be.

That is a position I have advanced before. The member is well aware of that.

Second, I can indicate that from a statistical point of view over the last 10 years, the degree of penetration of foreign investment as a whole has significantly decreased in this province and in this country. That is a point of view which the member's research might reveal.

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, I am trying to figure out whether the minister is a Pocklington or a Gamble supporter. Is he prepared as a matter of basic policy in Ontario to require that before foreign-owned firms move out of the province and close down factories they should at least be prepared as a matter of policy to offer those plants to the workers in those plants?

Hon. Mr. Walker: Mr. Speaker, that is a very valid thing and I would like to encourage that. I would certainly never be part of any organization that would pass a law that would require it. However, I am certainly prepared to encourage that wherever possible and find it would be unfortunate if that happened otherwise. I support the principle but I am not prepared to see a law passed that requires that to be done. I do not think that is in keeping with decent business in the province.

EDUCATION FOR MENTALLY HANDICAPPED

Mr. Laughren: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Community and Social Services on a problem with which I believe he is familiar. The minister is fully aware that in the Sudbury area many retarded children are not getting speech pathology services because for one thing his ministry, which provides funds to the Algoma sanatorium, does not attach any strings to those and the san has refused to provide the service to school-aged children.

The ministry has refused to provide funding for assessment and programs because it is the responsibility of the Ministry of Education. Education says it is the responsibility of the boards of education, and they say it is the responsibility of Health and Community and Social Services. In the meantime, these children are getting no services.

Will the minister tell us why he is not prepared to provide short-term funding for May and June in order to provide the service and to have a policy put in place down the road?

Hon. Mr. Drea: For the simple reason, Mr. Speaker, that there is a policy. At every other

place where there is an equivalent to the Sudbury Algoma Hospital there is no problem with the provision of speech pathology; none. The member should not shake his head at me.

At the Windsor Western Hospital Centre they may be a bit short, but there is no problem as to whose responsibility it is. There is no problem in Hamilton. There is no problem in Ottawa.

Mr. Laughren: Those are not the facts and the minister knows it. It is a blatant distortion.

Mr. Speaker: Question please.

Mr. Laughren: Is the minister aware that when children are in institutions they are provided with a service but when they are taken out of the institutions and put into the community they are refused service from anybody in the community? This is at a time when the minister's deinstitutionalization program is in place across the province. How can the minister justify such perverse policies that say to people in the community, "As long as your child is in an institution, this service will be provided; when that child is not in the institution, that service will be refused"?

Does the minister really believe his own words when he says there is no problem in this situation across the province? Of course there is a problem across the province. How can he justify that kind of statement? It is nonsense.

Hon. Mr. Drea: I would appreciate it if the honourable member would not distort my words. He talked about a particular funding problem at the particular children's mental health hospital in Sudbury.

Mr. Laughren: No.

Hon. Mr. Drea: He did.

Mr. Laughren: Not just in Sudbury.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Drea: He did and that is the answer he got. He is awfully good at trying to distort everything.

The particular problem that the member talks about in the Sudbury area is one that does give me some concern; but I am not going to step in and accept all the responsibility or the very thing that he is complaining about—that when one is out in the community one gets no service—will get perpetuated. We are—

Mr. Martel: So the kids can do without the service.

Hon. Mr. Drea: What is the problem of the member for Sudbury East?

Mr. Speaker: Never mind the interjections, please. Just respond to the question.

Hon. Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, I believe I did respond to the particular question.

ST. CLAIR REGION CONSERVATION AUTHORITY

Mr. Van Horne: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Government Services. I realize the Minister of Correctional Services (Mr. Leluk) is hugging him; there must be something catching across the floor.

Given that his ministry has been directed by cabinet to act as an agent for the St. Clair Region Conservation Authority in settling the expropriation claims with land owners in Moore and Sombra townships, for land which is required for purposes of a water diversion system to divert water from the Sydenham River to the St. Clair River for flood control purposes, and given that an extension to February 28, 1983, for making payment was obtained by court order, would the minister tell the House why payment has been made to only two of the 135 owners whose land and/or property was expropriated?

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: Mr. Speaker, it is true that we were asked by the Ministry of Natural Resources to go in and do an appraisal of approximately 15 properties in that area. At the present time, I have just given my two colleagues an update on that. We have purchased or put through offers to purchase by the advisory committee, made up of the Ministry of Natural Resources and the conservation authority, for seven of those properties. The eight remaining will go through as soon as possible. Some of them are in the process of being accepted and on others there are still further negotiations.

There seems to be one lawyer working on behalf of all the people and he is working down the list of cases. As I understand it, the offer has been made in most cases but to the present time the lawyer acting on behalf of the people has not come back with a counter offer.

Mr. Van Horne: This whole proposal has been described by the inquiry officer, who made the first ruling back in the fall, as "a gross case of bureaucratic bungling." It would seem that the bungling is being carried on.

My understanding is that there are still more than 100 owners of property, or property and homes, who have not been informed in any way, shape or form of offers. Some of them are people who simply have an easement for flood control purposes now on their property.

Can the minister give me and those people

any assurance that the deadline, which was to have been February 28, will not be extended any further and that some form of offer will be made to them in the month of May 1983?

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: I have to defend our ministry. The honourable member said there has been some sort of bungling going on and apparently it is still going on. I would like to assure him that since we were asked to come and give an outside, private appraisal on it we have done that and have done it very quickly.

3 p.m.

We are just acting as agents, as I said before, for the Ministry of Natural Resources and the conservation authorities. The 15 that I mentioned were people who were going to have to be bought out, and we were coming in with offers. I mentioned the seven that have already accepted. The honourable member said two, but I think if he checks now he will find that it is up to seven.

Eight of those are in the process, and the lawyer for those people is looking after them one at a time. It seems that each of these people has sought legal counsel of the same person.

We are dealing with the ones where there are flood plains after we get the ones that we figure are complete buy-outs finished; but it is a big job, and I cannot give the member an exact time when it will be finished, other than to say that I have had meetings with my staff and we are moving along as quickly as possible.

PRICE RESTRAINT CRITERIA

Mr. Swart: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations. I am sure the minister will recall that Bill 179, which was passed four and a half months ago, requires that he review administered price increases under economic criteria that he is required to establish.

Will the minister tell this House when he established the criteria, if he has; how many prices he has reviewed; and, if he has referred any to the Inflation Restraint Board, what services and companies are represented in those referrals?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, it is my recollection that those criteria were tabled. Second, I do not have the exact number of matters that have been reviewed. And yes, one has been referred to the Inflation Restraint Board, and I am not prepared to discuss it at the moment.

Mr. Swart: If that is the price increase awarded

to Consumers' Gas, is the minister aware that the award they got of \$20.1 million for their own use represents much more than a five per cent increase, that its profits in the first quarter of this year set a new high and that it has now asked for a further increase, which will amount to an additional 10 per cent increase in its own revenue for distributing gas?

If the minister has not referred that one to the Inflation Restraint Board, will he refer it? If not, why not?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: I cannot recall any recent matter related to Consumers' Gas that has been before the administered prices committee. When it comes before us, I will deal with it in the appropriate fashion.

FUNDING BY WINTARIO

Mr. O'Neil: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Citizenship and Culture. The minister is no doubt aware of the report released last week by the Joint Task Force on Neighbourhood Support Services, which highlights the desperate need for core funding in Metropolitan Toronto to keep neighbourhoods alive.

Considering their findings, which state that, excluding projects of a regional or provincial issue, the province paid out \$3 per person in Wintario grants to every government riding in Metro while it paid out an average of only \$1 in ridings held by opposition members, will the minister tell us whether he plans to increase funding to these other ridings?

Hon. Mr. McCaffrey: Mr. Speaker, I was aware of the report, and I am quite prepared either to share it privately or to table a more detailed response. While the report did imply that members of the government party received favoured treatment, at the same time it did show clearly that it is the central part of Metro Toronto, notwithstanding constituencies, that gets the support.

I just share with my friend the fact that the former member for St. George was a Liberal and the present member of St. George (Ms. Fish) is not a Liberal—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. McCaffrey: I mention that because that particular constituency of St. George is in that urban centre and is a portion of downtown Metro that has received a goodly amount of money. Where the Royal Ontario Museum and Roy Thomson Hall are located has a great deal

more to do with the history of those buildings than with the constituency they are in. I think an important point has been raised, and it might be fairer and more thorough if I tabled a more detailed response to it.

I think everybody understands that, from the outset of the Wintario program and the subsequent lottery games, there has been tremendous care taken by all members of the Legislature, who clearly at the time of estimates look to see if there are any of those kinds of abuses. We are extra sensitive in the ministry that those things do not happen, for very obvious reasons.

I think everybody understands that at the core of the Wintario money and the way it is distributed is the fact that we respond to local initiatives. To put it bluntly, the riding I represent is one of those that have received very little money. The fact is, we cannot put an art gallery or a museum in a community that does not want it and is not able to support it; but I would be prepared to give more details on that.

Mr. O'Neil: If the minister reviewed my initial question, I think he would see that I mentioned it was excluding such things as the Royal Ontario Museum and some of these other larger projects.

Is the minister disputing the graphs and figures that were released last week that definitely show a three-to-one ratio between government ridings and opposition members' ridings? I would like to know, first of all, whether the minister disputes those figures.

I would also like to ask him whether he proposes to make a change so that some of the other ridings that are not receiving the proper amount of funding are assisted and will have the long-term core funding that is essential to some of these community services in Metro Toronto.

Mr. Speaker: Does the minister propose to make a change? That is the question.

Hon. Mr. McCaffrey: No, I do not accept the reality of those figures; so there will be no changes based on that submission.

When the member takes a look at my detailed response, he will see that a change is not necessary. What is required is clarification as to Wintario, Lottario, Super Loto and Provincial moneys and how they are invested, and my work sheet will help in that regard.

MECHANICS' LIEN ACT PRACTICES

Mr. Breaugh: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Consumer and Commercial

Relations concerning some practices that have sprung up around the Mechanics' Lien Act.

It has been brought to my attention that some builders are now making it a condition of sale, on the purchase of a new home, that the purchaser set up the trust fund that is laid out in this act and that we all thought would be carried on by the builder. Is it legal to make such a condition of sale? It certainly imposes a great hardship on people who are trying to purchase new homes.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: With respect, Mr. Speaker, I could look into that but, as the honourable member knows, that particular legislation is from the Attorney General's ministry and I have no current information about what the practices are there. However, I will advise my colleague of the member's question.

Mr. Breagh: Mr. Speaker, while the minister is looking into that, would he take a look at some of the practical problems people are experiencing? Many people trying to purchase a home with this kind of condition put on the closing of the sale are finding it very difficult to come up with financing that may be in the order of \$10,000 to \$15,000 for a 45-day period.

Would the minister take a look at some of these practices, and, most urgently, tell people what they can do if they are faced with a situation where they must close the transaction? What options do they have?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Again, Mr. Speaker, all I can say is that I will draw these matters to the attention of the minister in charge of that act.

Mr. Sweeney: Is the minister aware of the fact that the Royal Trust company has issued a directive to its district managers not to take on any residential mortgages whatsoever because of the Mechanics' Lien Act?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: No, I was not.

3:10 p.m.

LIBRARY BOARDS

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Citizenship and Culture on the document entitled A Foundation for the Future, the consultation paper on public libraries. I would like to draw to the minister's attention that the 28-page report was done without any mention at all of the francophone issues as far as libraries are concerned.

Is the minister aware that there was a report published only a year ago, known as the Desjardins-Gagné report, and that report number 8 of the Ontario public library program

review was released shortly afterwards? Is he also aware that the Council on Franco-Ontarian Affairs, only a month before the release of this document, had recommended major changes in the structure of libraries of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. McCaffrey: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure whether I can quickly find the relevant section that I wanted to quote back to the honourable member. I think he may be correct that it does not specify Franco-Ontarian communities, but throughout the pages in the consultation paper there is consistent reference to the fact that the local library boards, and the municipalities that appoint the local library boards in main, are to be sensitive to the needs of their local communities. That has been a tradition for a century in this province which we have no intention of changing. It clearly refers to the francophone communities in a number of regions of the province.

The same point would hold with regard to ethnic representation and appointments from separate and/or public school boards, where we left some more options in here so the library boards would be able to run their policies on the basis of the needs of their respective communities.

So while the words "francophone" and "francophone representations" may not be there, and I cannot find it right off hand, there is no question that we were sensitive to that reality throughout and attempted to be consistent in each of the pages of the discussion paper to emphasize the need for these boards to respond to local needs.

NOTICE OF DISSATISFACTION

Mr. Laughren: Mr. Speaker, pursuant to standing order 28(a), I wish to give notice of my dissatisfaction with the incredible answer from the incredible Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Drea), earlier during this question period, and I wish to have the matter more fully debated tomorrow night at adjournment.

PETITIONS

NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT

Mr. Eakins: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table a petition, but I would ask your indulgence. To me, this appears to be a petition, or it may be ruled an expression of concern.

It is signed by the staff and students of Fenelon Falls Secondary School, Fenelon Falls, who are in the Speaker's gallery today. It reads in part:

"While we realize that the provincial gov-

ernment has no authority to act in regard to nuclear arms reduction, none the less we strongly urge the government of Ontario to take a definitive stand in favour of nuclear arms reduction and that this position be communicated to the government of Canada to support an effective program to lower the risk of nuclear attack."

It is signed by the staff and students of Fenelon Falls Secondary School.

BULK FOODS

Mr. Pollock: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table a petition with the Minister of Health (Mr. Grossman). The petition has 2,577 names on it, and it is from five bulk food stores in Campbellford, Belleville, Norwood and Havelock.

The petition is straightforward and states: "I am pleased with the method that the stores are using to dispense food."

The petition was delivered to my constituency office, and I would like to pass it on to the Minister of Health. I would like the record to show that it was delivered to the Minister of Health.

MOTION

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BUSINESS

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding any order of the House, private members' public business will be not taken up until Thursday, May 19, 1983.

Motion agreed to.

INTRODUCTION OF BILL

BOROUGH OF EAST YORK ACT

Mr. Williams moved, seconded by Mr. Rotenberg, first reading of Bill Pr6, An Act respecting the Borough of East York.

Motion agreed to.

BUDGET DAY PROCEDURE

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I thought I might clarify for the House the procedure that will be followed on budget day, next Tuesday, May 10. We will begin as usual at 2 p.m. with routine proceedings and we have undertaken not to have any ministerial statements. When routine proceedings are concluded, if there is still some time left before 4 p.m., the House will adjourn for a period of time, perhaps 10 or 15 minutes, and at exactly 4 p.m. the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) will begin the budget address, which will be

concluded by 6 p.m. There will be no night sitting that night.

Pursuant to the motion the House just passed concerning private members' afternoon, it has been agreed that the responses from both the official opposition and the third party will be made on the afternoon of May 12. Again we will not have any statements and the time will be split equally, so that the two responses to the budget will be on the afternoon of May 12.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(continued)

Resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

Mr. MacQuarrie: Mr. Speaker, when the debate adjourned, I had pointed out how important it was to ensure that Ontario industries have available to them the most up-to-date technology and equipment to allow them to compete successfully in the marketplaces of the world and that it was also important to develop a high-technology sector in Ontario.

I mentioned that we faced two problems. The first problem is inadequate domestic research and development and our comparatively low expenditures on research and development activities. The second problem is technological lag, with our traditional industries being extremely slow in adapting best-practice technologies to their operations.

I indicated that our comparative expenditures on research and development would have to increase. I also suggested that the Ontario technology centres would help to ensure that Ontario industry would be internationally competitive.

However, I noted that a number of points should be kept in mind when assessing the role the technology centres would play in helping us meet the challenge of the new industrial revolution.

First, the centres should give special emphasis to the development and transfer of domestic technologies without neglecting offshore technologies that our industries could use to advantage. We should bear in mind that a great deal of technology developed in Canada is exploited offshore.

Second, we must increase our own research and development efforts to avoid becoming more and more dependent for technology and

technological advance on those nations that do invest heavily in basic scientific and industrial research and against whom our industries must compete.

If we do become technologically dependent on others, we will always be behind our competitors in developing, applying and exporting technologies. As I pointed out, in this case our technology centres will be able at best to help our industries keep up with yesterday.

3:20 p.m.

Third, in my opinion it is vital that close links be established between provincial agencies such as the technology centres, the Ontario Research Foundation, the Innovation Development for Employment Advancement Corp. and other agencies in other provinces and at the national level.

I referred earlier to the National Research Council, one of the world's foremost research agencies, with internationally recognized expertise across the whole scientific and technological spectrum and a strong, well-trained, skilled support staff.

The NRC was established to undertake, assist or promote scientific and engineering research to further Canada's economic and social development. It maintains a close working relationship with Canadian industries, universities and other government agencies. The NRC also enjoys an excellent rapport with industries, universities and government research establishments in many foreign jurisdictions.

Although the NRC operates research facilities in centres in various parts of the country and abroad, its major facilities are in Carleton East. The NRC operates a scientific and industrial research program designed, among other things, to assist Canadian industries to develop new and improved methods, products, systems, techniques and services.

This government shares with the NRC the common objectives of improving industrial output, encouraging technological innovation and effecting the transfer to industry of best-practice technologies.

It would be a waste if we did not develop a much closer working relationship with the NRC than exists at present. After all, the mandate of the NRC includes close co-operation with the provinces and with provincial research establishments.

I know the NRC is more than willing to co-operate with the province in attaining our common goals. For instance, almost two years ago the NRC indicated it would permit the

province to establish a distinctive provincial technology centre on part of its Montreal Road campus.

The NRC is often at the cutting edge of technological research and new industrial techniques. A close link with the NRC would give us early access to research activities and research results which could be further developed by our technology centres or other research agencies or transferred directly to Ontario industry or Ontario entrepreneurs.

This could be particularly beneficial since the NRC is carrying out research and making significant advances in areas that are of special interest to Ontario, from energy to genetic engineering, from computer applications to fusion technology, from medical equipment and technology to flexible manufacturing and membrane technology.

Furthermore, a close link with the NRC would provide us with an excellent window on national and international research and development. A provincial technology centre on the Montreal Road campus of the NRC would place this province at the centre of the action in research and development. Such a centre would permit the ready transfer of NRC technology to our centres, industries or entrepreneurs.

In addition, such a centre could serve as a mechanism whereby we would be able to co-ordinate our research efforts with those of the NRC and other agencies in those areas of special interest to the province or of special significance to other industries.

The NRC is there to be used and wants to be used. In my opinion, we are not currently making use of this agency to the extent that we could. I would therefore strongly urge the Minister of Industry and Trade (Mr. Walker) to immediately take up with the NRC the establishment of a centre of the type proposed. We cannot afford to wait.

The NRC is anxious to see that its technologies are made available to Canadian industries and that industrial problems are referred back to its laboratories for solutions. It seems to me the least we could do in the interest of our economy would be to work with the council to achieve that goal. It would cost us very little and the returns could be potentially great indeed. It seems to me that such a centre would be more than worth the investment.

Above all, I believe that if we are fully to realize our research potential and get the best return for our investment, it is essential that an effective liaison be established to ensure that

national and provincial research and development efforts are co-ordinated. It would be a waste of resources to have all these centres busy reinventing the wheel or unnecessarily duplicating each other's research and development programs.

For instance, we have a number of computer-aided design/computer-aided manufacturing centres sprouting up hither, thither and yon, and something must be done to ensure that the efforts of these various agencies are co-ordinated. We are too small a country to be able to afford that type of waste.

In the throne speech the government suggests it will act to ensure that a skilled and appropriately trained labour force is available to Ontario industry. Obviously a priority will be the creation of a labour pool capable of performing in a high-technology environment. We must then invest in people as well as in technology.

In 1980, the microelectronics task force report stated: "The government has a positive role to play in the provision of the supply of highly skilled personnel." It also noted: "The government should be actively involved with labour and industry in creating training and retraining programs for workers." In the coming months, I look for our efforts in this area to be expanded.

Looking to the long term, we must ensure that part of this effort is concentrated on our universities. In Ontario we have some excellent universities. I do not think it is an exaggeration to say some of our professional and technical schools and departments are world class. In the future we must do what we can to maintain this standard and to bring more of our institutions up to it by providing the resources necessary to help them improve upon their already fine performance.

3:30 p.m.

As part of this effort, we also must encourage more of our young people to pursue careers in scientific and engineering disciplines. It will not be enough, however, for this government to limit its efforts and programs to the provision of a skilled labour pool. We must also be prepared to deal responsibly and effectively with one of the negative consequences, at least in the short run, of industrial high technology, the loss of some traditional job opportunities in our industries. While high technology will create new jobs requiring new skills, it is also possible that it will lead to the creation of a new type of structural unemployment in our society.

To address this problem in the short term, this government must put in place programs to

support the displaced worker. In the long term, we must be prepared to look at and seriously consider more novel solutions, such as concentration on labour-intensive as opposed to labour-saving technologies, or reduction in the working hours of the individual worker.

In the throne speech, the government notes that it will work to increase innovation in all sectors of our economy. At present, apart from the research being done by government laboratories, the most innovative and original research in the province is done by the universities and by industry. The government, through the Board of Industrial Leadership and Development, already supports research in both these sectors.

BILD and the University of Toronto, for example, have set up the Institute for Hydrogen and Electrochemical Systems. It is interesting to note that the National Research Council is also involved in hydrogen research. This serves to underline the importance of close liaison in our research sector.

In the private sector, BILD funds a high-technology financing program through the Ontario Development Corp. We would realize a better return on these investments if we co-ordinated the research activities in these two sectors—industry and universities. Certainly the desire is there on the part of industry and universities for a greater degree of structured interaction.

In a recent address, the president of the University of Western Ontario said he envisioned greater interaction among communities of scientists in the future, including scientists in industry. Dr. Connell stated this interaction should be arranged by the university administration or even a higher authority.

On the industry side, the Canadian Council of Professional Engineers has called for closer industry and university liaison to overcome what it refers to as the two solitudes. This type of interaction would result in the better use of available technical manpower and equipment to the benefit of both industry and the universities.

Our Innovation Development for Employment Advancement Corp. will supposedly serve as a technology broker among private, public and university research sectors. Although I am not sure if this broker role will involve the IDEA Corp. in direct organizational work, I think this is one area where we as a government could and should do more. For example, we could develop a provincial program similar to the federal industrial fellowship program. Under this program, qualified university staff would be able to

spend a year in industry and become familiar with its production problems and research needs. This would not only help to direct university research towards industry's needs, but also might help motivate students to conduct research in the same area. Thus, this program could contribute, even if only indirectly, to the creation of the scientific expertise we will require to remain competitive.

In addition, we could use this program to encourage practising professional engineers and research scientists working in industry to teach in our universities. Again, this would provide an opportunity to improve communication, enhance interaction and interest students in the area of industrial research. An exchange and fellowship program supported by this government could be complemented by a special scholarship fund for graduate students in engineering and the sciences. Alternatively, the government could use the student aid program as a mechanism for attracting students into strategic fields of study.

Of course, there is little point in educating and training people to work in high technology if they find no place to work when their training is completed. We must develop our own high technology sector if we want to keep those highly skilled individuals in the province. Canada has too long been known as an exporter of brains.

In the speech from the throne, this government set itself two very ambitious goals: to increase domestic market expansion and to double foreign trade over the next five years. Expanding the domestic market will demand an increase in consumer confidence to the point where people feel it is safe for them to spend some of their savings. We can also increase domestic demand for domestic products by continuing our import substitution and buy-Canadian programs.

We need a significant growth in demand to bring our industries back up to operating capacity and to alleviate our unemployment problems. For real growth, however, we have to look beyond our domestic market to the export market. The Canadian market is simply too small to allow us to rely solely on domestic demand to support our industrial base.

It is apparent the less developed and newly industrialized countries are taking over the mass production industries which used to be the mainstays of the western economies. If we are going to compete with these producers, we run the risk of being constantly undercut. Reliance on resource industries for export revenues will

be even more questionable in the future than it was in the past.

International resource commodity markets are always risky and uncertain. Last year our experience with the nickel market showed just how tough the competition can become. Technologically advanced economies are supplementing their export of commodities with the export of expertise. Trading nations such as Japan are beginning to broaden their export bases. The growth area in international trade is the export of techniques, of ways of doing things and making things better.

It will be no mean feat to double our export trade in five years, but it will be worth the effort since any increase in trade will mean more job opportunities for the people of Ontario. In order fully to realize our export potential, in particular I urge the government to support and encourage exports by high technology companies. This could be done through the international marketing and export financing programs under the Board of Industrial Leadership and Development.

In the throne speech, the government announced it will undertake an extensive and serious study of the impact these new technologies will have on our lives. This is a sound idea, and certainly there are enough unknowns about both potential effects and the implications for public policy to make this a valuable project.

3:40 p.m.

Since the government appears to be in favour of serious and extensive studies, there is one that I would like to see made. I would call this study, to give it the proper bureaucratic ring, the Ontario industry technology assessment survey.

This survey would consist of two parts. One part would concentrate on Ontario industries and would involve an evaluation against the world standard of the production technologies and productivity of our industries. This type of information would help us identify our strengths and our weaknesses and where it would be best to invest our scarce resources.

Once we had identified the competitive sectors in our industrial base and the most competitive firms within those sectors, we could undertake a comprehensive market study to determine how the competitiveness and growth potential of these industries could best be exploited.

It has become commonplace when speaking about Canada's economic future at least to allude to our poor record on productivity. If our productivity problem could be solved by the

number of newspaper and periodical articles written about it, then ours would have been solved long ago. Unfortunately, that is not the case.

In the throne speech the government says it will attempt to improve our productivity. To assist this government in reaching that goal I suggest that a provincial productivity centre be established.

I am aware that the federal government has indicated its intention to set up a national productivity centre. However, I do not see why that should preclude us from establishing our own. In the first place, the federal government is not known for its speed or its productivity. There is no reason we should wait for them to get organized. It could be a long wait.

Second, productivity is a major problem for manufacturing in Canada. About half, 49 per cent, of the national manufacturing plant is located in Ontario. It seems sensible that there should be one organization dedicated solely to the analysis and discussion of the problems faced by our manufacturers and the possible solutions to those problems. We need a forum in which representatives of Ontario's industries, labour organizations and government can have an ongoing exchange of ideas.

Finally, I must say I was disappointed that the speech from the throne did not announce the creation of a ministry of science and technology. Such a ministry is needed to design, implement and administer a co-ordinated and comprehensive plan for technological development in the province. A ministry of science and technology could co-ordinate the wide range of research activities being carried out by the ministries of this government and by our universities and hospitals.

The ministry could establish and maintain effective liaison with other research agencies at the provincial and national levels. Such a ministry would ensure that the taxpayer of this province would get the maximum return on his high-tech investment dollar. Most important, a ministry of science and technology would serve as a focal point through which new technology could be passed on to Ontario industry and interested entrepreneurs.

I am firmly convinced of the need in Ontario for a ministry of science and technology. Only a line ministry with a mandate focused specifically on this area will be able to do the job which must be done if Ontario is to be competitive in tomorrow's markets. High technology and its

impact on our economy is not a momentary thing that will fade away at the end of the decade or at the end of the century. It is a self-perpetuating, evolutionary process that will constantly and continually present us with new challenges and new opportunities.

If we are committed to taking advantage of these new opportunities for the benefit of all Ontarians, we must put in place the infrastructure that will enable us to do so in the most efficient and effective manner. A ministry of science and technology is the essential element in that infrastructure. Only such a ministry would be able to devise, implement and administer the sustained, co-ordinated effort that is required to ensure our industries do not become economic mediocrities in this century.

Ontario has never been a second-best province. There is no reason, given our human and natural resources, why we should be so in the future. Let us not give high technology our second-best effort. If we do, we cheat not only ourselves but also our children. If we are to give our best effort, in my view we can only do so through a ministry solely dedicated to that task. I would respectfully but forcefully urge this government to give serious consideration to the creation of a ministry of science and technology.

In looking at the markets of tomorrow, shaped as they will be by the impact of high technology, I see a world such as that aptly described in Lewis Carroll's *Through the Looking-Glass*, where the Red Queen said that it is a world in which we will have to run as hard as we can just to stay where we are; if we want to get anywhere, we will have to run twice as hard.

In Ontario, we have the skills, expertise, resources and manpower which will let us run twice as hard, and we must run twice as hard if we are to improve our standard of living. This throne speech demonstrates we are at least in the race. I submit that if we expand some of our programs in the directions I have indicated, our prospects of winning will be improved.

Mr. Ruston: Mr. Speaker, looking through the throne speech, one gets a little disillusioned with the system, as I suppose one would call it. Each year the government comes out with the ideas and generalities of what it thinks should be done in the province.

Some throne speeches spend more time talking about what other governments do or do not do. This one, this year, has not really spent any time on that and has not spent much time on the things the government should be doing. It leaves a great deal to be desired.

This gives a member an opportunity to put in some of his own ideas as to what he would like to see in a throne speech if he were making one. The time of eight days is allotted so people can reply to the speech from the throne under our system in the Legislature.

3:50 p.m.

From looking over parliamentary rules, I know that time limits are allocated in a number of areas of operations of the House, such as bills, the throne speech debate, replies to the budget speech and so on. We have not necessarily done that in the eight-day time allocation. I suppose there is not the interest in it that perhaps some members should take, and that is understandable when one looks at the throne speech, because it really does not get down to the nitty-gritty of the things that should be done. Most people seem to look to the budget speech because that is really where the nuts and bolts are, when it comes to the financial part of government. However, even with regard to the budget which we will be dealing with on May 10, there is not the same kind of anticipation as to whether it will mean that much to the economy.

From looking at the actual budget over the last number of years, it would appear that this government has got itself into what I would call a corner, as far as financing goes. Of course, this government is not the only one. The United States is in the position of having one of the highest deficits it has ever had. The government of Canada is in the same position, and it is too bad that we are mortgaging our grandchildren's future.

It seems to me that at one time it was a common thing for a family to want to assist the grandchildren as they came along. The government seems to do the opposite. They appear to want to burden them with the debts of the last two or three decades. In a way, we are really putting an awful burden on our future generations. I suppose to some extent the fault lies in governments thinking the way many individuals thought, which was that there was no end to the inflation cycle and governments could continue to spend and print money without any problems.

With all of these deficits, it comes down to who will pay them and what they will do to the money market. Certainly I am not an expert in money markets, but I have read cursory reports here and there in magazines, newspaper articles, editorials and so forth from our so-called economists.

Economists are like other people who make

up our society; they have certain ideas, and if one were to ask 10 economists what to do about the financial structure of our country, I suppose one would get 11 ideas. It is almost like that. I find even those who study books and go to university for five or 10 years and acquire long titles after their names are not really all that smart when it comes to financing. I do not know whether they read so much they get the idea it can be done on paper, but the trouble is, they forget that human beings think differently from what is put down on paper; they live differently and have their own priorities. One of this government's priorities in the last year or two was buying 25 per cent of a large oil company.

One person told me he thought that at the present time the financial structure of Ontario was bordering on a \$3-billion deficit. That is more than the total budget at the time the Premier (Mr. Davis) took office in 1971.

The rationale for buying into this company was that one had to have a window on the oil companies to see what the others were doing. Someone said it is similar to a person who has been laid off work for about a year and has saved maybe \$1,000; he has two or three children and the future does not look that great for him, but he goes out and borrows money at 15 per cent interest in order to buy a new Cadillac. As far as I can see, the Ontario government did about the same thing when it bought Suncor.

It did not bring any jobs; it did not make one job in Ontario. The federal government had already purchased a window on the oil companies. Of course, a poll was taken at that time and, if I remember correctly, about 60 per cent of the people in Canada felt it was a good idea that the federal government buy an oil company and have a window so they could see just what went on.

In my opinion, it would have been fine if they had bought an oil company in the development area; but as far as I am concerned, I would never have bought out British Petroleum; and I would never even have opened a service station under Petro-Canada. If I had been doing it, it would have been a window in the door of the processing and development end of it; but then I would have put my oil and gas up for sale, and if you wanted to buy it you would bring a truck in and buy it and we would sell it. That is the ideal situation that the government should be in, it seems to me, not in the everyday servicing of cars and so forth.

I know that the New Democratic Party thinks

this is a great idea. They want to run all the gas stations in Canada and in Ontario.

Mr. Breagh: Just the Petro-Canada stations.

Mr. Ruston: They want to be the ones who hire everybody.

Mr. R. F. Johnston: A little earlier you were telling us a Liberal was a Liberal.

Mr. Ruston: Now, that's an interesting point; and it is like a Conservative being a Conservative, I suppose. I think one of the your NDP friends in Ottawa is—well, I don't know if I should really bring that up. I don't think you would like me to bring up the fact that the NDP were in favour of a lot of social things that you and I would not approve of.

But the interesting one was the Conservative Laura Sabia. She ran for the Conservatives here in Toronto not very long ago, and she thinks it is absolutely ridiculous for us to spend \$650 million for a 25 per cent piece of the action in Suncor. She says:

"Thanks a lot, Willie, for adding \$325 million to our present provincial debt, making it a whopping \$1.3 billion for fiscal '81 with not even an extra barrel of oil added to our supplies or one new job created."

As I think our leader mentioned during question period today, we are paying interest of anywhere from \$50 million to \$75 million a year just to have that little window. You can buy a lot of jobs for that.

Mr. Breagh: You could buy a whole Petro-Canada station for that.

Mr. Ruston: You could develop it into an awful lot of work. We have so much unemployment. There are a lot of small industries to which we could have lent that money at a low interest rate over a period of five or 10 years. We could have developed many thousands of jobs if it had been made available. That is what we should be doing.

Mr. Boudria: We could build our own window factory.

Mr. Ruston: Now there's another thing. The member for Prescott-Russell says we could build our own window factory. Well, I am not sure we want to do that, but in my area two or three entrepreneurs are starting new window factories and they are doing very well. If the government got into it, I do not think they would do that well.

Mr. Boudria: It would be like the post office.

Mr. Ruston: I think we should be lending the

money to these small entrepreneurs and small industries, many of which are already developed. They just need the financing to put themselves into the new technologies that we are going to require for the next 10 or 20 years. For instance, we could lend them money that we are giving under the Board of Industrial Leadership and Development program. We gave \$3 million to the H. J. Heinz Co.; and \$1.3 million, I believe, to another tomato factory in our area; and that is an outright grant.

4 p.m.

I had a fellow call me from one of the small tomato plants in our area. He said he had run his place for 11 years and up to the present he has had no need of assistance, but he thinks he should perhaps apply for some if they are going to start giving away money. His idea is not to give away the money but to give him a loan, perhaps in the first year with no interest or a very low interest rate, and as the years go on and the business picks up they could increase the interest rate over a cycle of 10 years until it was paid off. That is what I call recycling money; that would help considerably.

It is similar to what the member for Huron-Middlesex (Mr. Riddell) said about tile drainage loans. The Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Timbrell) will get up with the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) when he makes his report to say the government is going to give \$20 million or \$30 million for tile loans. But it is really not that amount, because he is putting it out in loans and it is coming back every year in payments, so he is recycling that money. He is not putting in \$30 million or \$40 million of new money every year, but it sounds as if he is. The minister likes to make it sound great.

Our agriculture critic, who is well versed on this matter, brings that to the minister's attention quite often when he starts to say the government is doing so much. They are really overstating it completely and trying to bamboozle the farmers into thinking they are doing a lot for them when really it is very little. If one looks at the total agriculture budget in Ontario it is only about one per cent or 1.5 per cent of the total budget, so it is very minimal. I see a figure popping up there of 1.1 per cent.

One of the things that concerns me is something a neighbour brought to my attention a couple of times. People who never come into this place sometimes have a different view from us. We do not always think about the real things we should be doing. Perhaps it is because we

have to sit here listening to all the bamboozling that goes on by the government with all its fancy advertising, etc. They spend \$30 million or \$40 million a year trying to tell everybody what great fellows they are. I am thinking about the plans for house building. Just lately the federal government put out a grant of \$3,000 to buy a home, and it was not long ago that Ontario had a grant of \$1,500, back in 1975. I have a son who used that. I helped him move for two days so he could get in a day before the time for getting the grant ran out, and it helped some.

It really seems to me what we should be doing, especially at a time like this, now that we have interest rates coming down to a more sensible level, is taking that \$3,000 or whatever—the province had a grant of \$5,000 that it was lending over a period of 10 years and then the borrowers had to start paying interest on it—to guarantee an interest rate that goes along with inflation or something similar to that.

In other words, today if we could take a person who was buying a home for \$50,000, \$60,000 or \$70,000 and give him a mortgage for 75 per cent of that and the mortgage rate would be at today's rate for three years, somewhere around 11.5 per cent, we could guarantee that mortgage for 15 years at 11.5 or the equivalent if inflation were to go over a certain figure. Then if his wages went up he could afford to pay a quarter or a half per cent higher interest every two years, or whatever the case may be depending on inflation.

Instead of giving a grant to buy, if we used that money to guarantee a fair interest rate over the next 15 or 20 years I think it would encourage the purchase of houses even more than giving a grant. People like a little security when they sign their name on a \$50,000 mortgage. If they do not know what the interest rates will be in two years, it can be pretty devastating.

I could also talk about debts. There are people today, and I suppose they are economists, predicting that the interest rates could very well be 20 per cent by December 1984 or February 1985, due strictly to the high deficits of the United States government. That is worrisome. I read that in one financial paper which I think is printed in the United States.

I know it is only a prediction, but we can imagine what that would do to someone who had just bought a house in the Toronto area, where they cost \$100,000 or \$150,000, and got a mortgage for 11.5 per cent. Two years ago, when we had mortgage interest rates going up to 18 or 19 per cent, it was devastating. We cannot

stand that. It is not bearable by anyone. I do not think any government can allow that to happen again, because that type of interest rate is unbearable.

We need some written guarantee. I read in some articles prior to the bringing down of the new budget in Ottawa that they were planning some kind of mortgage insurance, but to this time I have not seen anything from the federal government on that matter so it is something we should be getting into here in Ontario.

It seems to me that in slow economic times we should be looking into the methods and systems of handling sanitary landfill sites. We are wasting a lot of time. We should be getting people involved in researching and developing that. There are different systems now. They are sorting out garbage and using incinerators.

I had an opportunity to read some articles about a number of places in the United States. There is a heavily populated area in Florida where my retired brother spent some time this winter. They opened a new incinerator in January in the fastest growing area in Florida, Pinellas county. They have had a terrible time down there in the last 10 or 15 years trying to get rid of their garbage. It is going to take about 75 per cent of their total garbage.

When filling a landfill site, the specifications that have been given at some of the meetings I have been at are that they can reduce the total going into a landfill site by about 75 to 85 per cent.

In my own area, Essex county is pretty flat country. When one drives down Highway 401 and gets within about 12 miles of Windsor, in the township of Maidstone, which I had the pleasure and honour to represent for about eight years as a reeve and councillor, they now have a sanitary landfill site. We used to call it a garbage dump when I was on the council. We had a small one and we had lots of problems just looking after the local municipality. Then the city of Windsor and the county of Essex made landfill areas and they now have three of them in Essex county.

They call them sanitary landfill sites. It sounds nice. At one time when people were poor they would call it going on relief. They changed it to welfare and now they call it social services. It is great stuff. All these people from university get all these nice words and it makes people feel good. I often wonder what they do at university. I would like to find out some day. It makes me wonder sometimes. They get all these fancy

words that make people feel good, but I do not think it really helps much.

A sanitary landfill site looks like a big mountain when one is driving down Highway 401. People are not used to seeing little mountains and hills in Essex county and they wonder what is going on. They will call up to ask, "What is that over there?" I say: "They are piling up the garbage for future generations. They may ski off it some day. They might play golf up there." I do not know whether that would be any good, but they are talking about all those things. It is great stuff.

I attended a public meeting not long ago in the civic centre in Essex. The county of Essex is doing something about it. The city of Windsor wanted to buy more land there and the county turned down the application for the land to be sold to Windsor for a sanitary landfill site. They already have 200 acres and they wanted to buy another 100, because at the rate they are going the 200 acres will be covered within about 10 years. I figure within 25 years, at the rate they are going now, they will have a hill from Highway 401 right down almost to Lake St. Clair. That is just not right. I do not think we should be damaging our future in that way. We have to have other systems.

4:10 p.m.

I can assure members that the 250 people at this public meeting were totally in favour of having proper systems put in. Incinerators could be put in and perhaps the steam could be used; proper sorting systems would be used so that glass and metal could be sorted out. In this way we could take care of these things in the future as they are in many countries in Europe, I understand, and in some of the cities in the United States.

That is something we definitely have to look at. It should be done now. We have the manpower, we have the universities and we have the people who can do the testing. The government keeps talking about doing this and doing that and says it has money available for that. I think the initiative has to come from the province, because for each local, regional or county government to get involved in this it is going to take a lot of money to set it up. After it has been set up and is operating, I think people will be prepared to pay for it.

At the meeting I held, people asked what it would cost to have it dumped in and taken care of. At present it is costing about \$5 a ton; they mentioned \$20 a ton. Of all the people at the meeting, there was not one person who objected

to paying for that to get rid of the mess. That is something that has to be done as quickly as possible.

There are one or two other things I would like to mention. One matter concerns the unemployment we have. We have make-work projects, and I will give the government credit for its co-operation with the federal government on the new employment expansion and development program, but again there is still a fair amount of criticism as to how that actually operates.

My understanding is that a person has to be off unemployment insurance benefits completely or on welfare to get a job in the NEED program. Of course, when one starts on a big project one has to call for tenders. Many companies employ a staff of 20 or 25 people, who may be laid off; but if they have not been laid off and are not collecting unemployment insurance, these companies cannot use these people for a lot of those jobs. There have been some problems getting that sorted out. It is not working as well as it should.

It seems to me we should be getting into some real projects that are doing things we need. In the city of Windsor, for example, there has been talk about building a chronic care hospital. The Minister of Health (Mr. Grossman) keeps saying: "You have been recommended for a chronic care hospital. It's in the program, but we do not know which year, 1984, 1990 or when." It seems to me this would be an ideal time to go ahead and build a chronic care hospital.

We have to look at the overall good of the country and the province and of the people in the area. When we are talking about needs and helping people to get off welfare and get work, we should be doing something the community can use. In the city of Windsor and the county of Essex—I do not have any hospitals in my own riding, and that is fine; we use the facilities in Windsor—I suppose 80 per cent of the people use the Windsor facilities, while the rest use some in Chatham and some in Leamington.

In Windsor there is a great need for a chronic care hospital, because the waiting lists in some of those hospitals are just terrible. We need more nursing home beds as well, but we really need a new chronic care hospital. Chronic care beds have been transferred into every one of the hospitals, and there may be 20, 30 or 50 in each one.

The Riverview Hospital in Windsor provided very good care for its chronic care patients. It is an old building and needs replacing, but the

care was excellent there. I have had relatives in there who really came along well. They had proper therapy for them. The staff there was trained to look after elderly people and I tell you, Mr. Speaker, you just could not get better care. But now that we have moved them all around I do not think any one hospital can really do that so well.

This would be the time to build it. I am sure when we are putting tenders out now for jobs, for buildings or whatever it is, whether it is constructing watermains, sewer lines, it is a very competitive time to have that done now and we could have a 250-bed chronic care hospital built there in 18 months if they really wanted to go ahead.

They have the plans pretty well ready and it would really solve a very serious problem in the city of Windsor in the future, because Essex county has a very high percentage of people over 60 or 65 years of age. We live in the sun parlour, as we call it—and although we get a few snow flurries there are not that many, not every year anyway—so we have a larger percentage of the ageing population in that area.

I would like to mention Ontario Hydro. Hydro has lost perspective of what it was really supposed to be: a utility for the people of Ontario. Where it went astray I am not sure. I am not sure if it is not the fault of the government or the Premier (Mr. Davis), or those he appointed into that little senate he has under the chairman of Hydro. He keeps moving his friends in there and we call these positions the senate in Ontario.

Ontario Hydro closed its plant in Windsor, the J. Clark Keith generating plant, a coal-fired plant. They closed it about six or seven years ago and mothballed it. Then they decided to open it up and take the mothballs out and they got a contract to sell hydro to the United States. Now the United States has cancelled that contract, or the contract ran out as of this year, and the old J. Clark Keith plant is going to be mothballed again.

They just do not seem to know what they are doing. They are able to generate about 50 per cent surplus hydro for what the requirements are for Ontario, and I think if anybody runs more than 25 per cent surplus in anything they are doing they are in deep trouble.

I can recall a few years ago when Chrysler just did not have the supervision or management or whatever. Not long ago they made thousands of cars and rented hundreds of acres to store them in. They said: "The cars are going to sell. We

will just make them. Do not worry." They had to tow the cars out of the mud with tractors when they finally did sell them some place, through fleets and so on. They lost millions of dollars because they made them and did not have a sale for them.

Hydro has built more hydro plants than we will ever need for the next 25 years at least. To build a nuclear plant it takes about 10 to 12 years from the time they start until they are ready for production and then sometimes they have problems with them. Hydro has put the province into terrible debt because of this. Ontario Hydro now has a \$15-billion debt and when you pay your hydro bill, Mr. Speaker—mine is around \$45 a month—about 42 per cent of it goes to paying off the debt. That is an awful percentage to be paying on the debt of a utility company. It just shows the mismanagement over the past 10 to 20 years that has caused it to be in this position.

This is a burden on the people of Ontario. This is a mortgage on our backs that we and our children have to carry on over the future and pay off at some time, and no one is to blame but Ontario Hydro and the government of Ontario under this Premier, because since he has been here he has never thought it necessary to pay the bills as they go. He always figured, "Let somebody else pay them," and that is the way he has run the province as Premier since 1971.

4:20 p.m.

I suppose a person could go on about the many things left out that should be in the throne speech and the things that we could do, but we have covered a number of the things that we feel are important. I have mentioned tile drainage and the way the government comes out with its announcements.

One of the best improvements for land is tile drainage. I know there are farms in Essex county and in my own family holdings of which some parts have never been tiled, partly because of the heavy clay soil. That heavy clay soil will work with tile and it saves erosion too. If one does not use tile the runoff causes some erosion of the land. That is a liability this property should not have.

The government raised the interest on tile drainage loans to 10 per cent two years ago. I asked the minister a question a week ago Friday about when he was going to lower the interest rates due to the lower prime rates now and so forth. He said he would be making an announcement on it in a few days. Last week he announced he had lowered it to eight per cent.

He still did not bring up the percentage he is paying. He left it at 60 per cent. A few years ago, 75 per cent of the total cost was included in that loan, but now it is only 60 per cent. At least he did go halfway and lowered the interest rate to eight per cent.

That did not cost him all that much because of the prime rate being what it is. I would hope that when the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) brings down his budget a week from Tuesday he will have considerably more money in it for the farm tile drainage system, because that is one of the areas where farmers can improve their production from 25 to 50 per cent or more; that is an area the farmers can use, and it improves the land.

That system is far better than the government giving a farmer a grant for a year just because he is a good fellow or he is a little short of money. Give him something to improve his production ability. Of course, we do need stabilization in the prices. This has been a good part of the problem this year. In the last three months the price of soybeans and corn has gone up almost a dollar a bushel, due mostly to the announcement in the United States that they are taking a lot of land out of production to try to avoid the high surpluses of corn and soybeans in the world now.

That is a very important matter, and if the farmer had this money available to tile his land, it would give him the opportunity for higher production and in that way he would be able to survive without government handouts.

I have covered all the things I wanted to. It is a little more interesting when one can deal with the budget because that is the nuts and bolts of it, the money part of it. The member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick) just came in. I told him I would be speaking until around 4:25 or 4:30. I am disappointed. I know he wanted to hear my speech.

He is a very highly respected member of the Legislature. He has been here since 1963. I have had the honour to sit on a number of committees with him and hear his legal expertise and I have had a great deal of respect for his thoughts on many occasions. However, I do not agree with all his philosophy that he may spout each day. I am sorry he missed my speech, but I will look forward to listening to his tomorrow.

Mr. Renwick: I will read it.

Mr. R. F. Johnston: Mr. Speaker, it is on days like this, when the weather is grey and rough outside, when the House is barely 20 per cent filled—to be generous—and when the newspa-

pers are out, the correspondence is being written and the conversations are taking place that we all participate in all the time—

Mr. T. P. Reid: We are all starting to nod off.

Mr. R. F. Johnston: Yes, there is some nodding off that takes place. It is on days like this that I sometimes get a little depressed about the relevancy of this august institution we have here.

I wonder who out there actually knows what we are discussing a lot of the time. Half the time I am not sure that all our own members here care very much about it. It is hard sometimes to get yourself up and enthusiastic for a speech when you know you are going to be looking at perhaps 21 or 22 members in the House out of 125 and nobody in the galleries except for the odd masochist who happens to have drifted in without realizing where he or she is.

It is also the case that I often feel—and I do not know about other members—

Mr. McClellan: Make some comments about Elgie's section.

Mr. R. F. Johnston: I must say that the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Elgie) seems a little isolated over there today.

Mr. McClellan: No more than usual.

Mr. R. F. Johnston: No, no more than his usual position in cabinet meetings, from what I hear. But I am a little disappointed to see not even the back-benchers there to support the red Tories in the caucus.

I cannot help but feel—and I mean this seriously and not whimsically—a little depressed these days about our position here, especially as an opposition member.

I remember the first time I sat in this chamber, in the last chair in the House at that point when there were by-elections in Scarborough West four years ago and a little bit. I started looking around and I thought: "You know, it is interesting. Everybody here has a role to play, like a little chamber theatre group where we all play our little part. We are all identifiable. They know us by our various categories." In fact, we get listed by the *Toronto Sun*, for instance, at the end of each year: who was the most eloquent, who was the funniest, who was the most irrelevant—and that is often the hardest one to choose, I think. We all have our little positions.

Mr. T. P. Reid: You are going to be at least a runner-up at the rate you are going.

Mr. R. F. Johnston: I am not sure. I find,

especially because we are in a majority situation, that there is a kind of automatic tyranny of the majority—that reality of March 19—which must take place in the ordering of business: the power of that majority always to maintain very strict control of the House.

We often feel we have no power here; we have no ability on this side of the House to get across a view that will have any major impact on the other side in any real way; that no matter how good one's question is that day, it is so easily just pushed aside—"I will refer it to the minister when he comes back from Switzerland" or "I have no comment at this point; I will get back to you"—or they come back in a partisan attack and the whole thing gets lost. The one question that gets picked up by the cameras that day is all that comes out of this place; it is all the people know about it.

Here we are at a time, in my view, when there are some really profound questions about the political morality of our governments today and about the relevancy of this whole body and its real effectiveness in touching people on the outside. I am burning with an anger that I think, if I might say so, is a little deeper and more depressing than the outrage that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Peterson) was feeling about the doctors recently. It just makes me feel like getting up here today and yelling and screaming at the other side to listen to what is going on out there and to look at the abject failure of our government in real moral terms before the people of Canada. I am attacking both the federal government and this provincial government when I say so.

4:30 p.m.

I believe this government is morally bankrupt if it does not face the real issue of unemployment, meet it head on and accept the fact that it has failed up to now but that it must deal with the problem now and cannot avoid it now. I cannot believe what the federal government decided it would do in terms of approaching this serious crisis, the trickle-down notion it has come forward with.

I also cannot help but believe that our government must be inept, that it has got by for 40 years here because we have been so affluent and because the whole nature of our economy has been Ontario-based. In that affluence we have benefited; anybody at all could have run this province.

But when times get tough, this government really does not know what to do. It sits back there and responds to pressures when it feels

they are getting a little high. It looks at the polls to see where the people want it to go and it follows those polls. But it has shown no leadership, no desire to react.

There are tremendous tragedies that are going on out there in our society today in Ontario. For that, I condemn this government in the harshest terms.

There is a tendency on this side of the House, because the Conservatives have been over there for so damned long, for us to start to look at ourselves as perennially in opposition and to say: "You know, they really are not so bad. Things in Ontario are not really that bad and if we keep pushing on the pressure, they will make changes." There is almost a desire that we be in opposition forever.

But, by God, watching the government's performance in the past number of years, when it has been needed most in terms of helping the people of Ontario, it has failed so abjectly that we must not persist in that tendency. These people have to be thrown out.

The government has been successful in defusing politics in this province and we have been unsuccessful on this side in politicizing things and polarizing issues. Mr. Speaker, look at the fact that only 58 per cent of the people bothered to come out and vote last time. The government has a huge majority with only 25 per cent of the possible voters supporting it. It has neatly made it seem as if there is no politics in Ontario; that there is no major disagreement about the way this province should be run, all it is is a question of management.

When we get up and we are outraged about something, with the kind of righteous indignation that the third party has been traditionally known for, the government always says it is concerned too. "I am just as concerned as you are," we hear from across the way; but the government will be judged by its acts. I suggest that in being judged by its acts now, it is found to be very wanting indeed.

In my view, the government has institutionalized poverty in this province. It has condemned hundreds of thousands of people to live in poverty, and it is unwilling to do anything about it; its record over the past couple of years shows that.

Along with the federal government, this government is now saying that maybe 10 per cent of the people in this province should be without work for the next number of years, that this is something we are just going to have to put up with. The rest of us will manage in this lovely

trickle-down recovery we are going through, but those people will have to suffer along.

Now King Billy of Brampton wants to run off to another sphere of influence. I say, "Go; please go." Having overseen from the provincial perspective the deinstitutionalization of this province, maybe he should go to the federal level. Believe me, he will not have success there; he is going to be exposed for what he has done here.

Let us look at poverty for a second. The gap between the rich and the poor has been increasing in this province. We have a minimum wage of \$3.50 an hour, \$140 a week. Only Newfoundland has a minimum wage lower than Ontario's—Ontario, the industrialized province; Ontario, the largest province in the country and the strongest in economic terms. That should be seen as a crime.

A Minister of Labour who can stand up and say that is not a crucial thing to overcome immediately—and this was last year—and does not move to increase that minimum wage substantially and to index that minimum wage to make sure it continues to increase with the cost of living is a Minister of Labour who is not fit to sit in his chair. Those are very harsh words, not the kind of niceties or playfulness we normally go through even when we are making attacks on the government, but I believe that fundamentally.

In the past year we increased the welfare rate by five per cent. Those people on welfare have not had an increase in 18 months, and in that time the cost of living has gone up by 26 per cent. The minimum wage did not increase in more than a year, but at the same time we in this House voted ourselves a five per cent increase, thinking that somehow should be accepted as equitable. We all know that is approximately the equivalent of what some of these people are living on for an entire year.

If one takes a look at what was given to the doctors in our society in the past 12 months while we have let these people live on \$3,000 per year income, one finds we gave the doctors an increase of approximately \$12,000 last year; out of the public purse essentially, through the Ontario health insurance plan. It is an interesting notion that at the same time as we have no money for the poor, we have hundreds of thousands of dollars for 14,000 already very privileged individuals in our society.

The balance of \$52 million that went into all the programs for income maintenance in this province, compared with more than \$200 mil-

lion going to 14,000 doctors, is not something that should be forgotten and is in my view fundamentally immoral.

I am not questioning the right of doctors to be well valued and well paid in our society, but surely a government that in this kind of recession and crunch is assisting that broadening of the gap between rich and poor is a government that is out of touch with the basic moral precepts that any government should be functioning under in a democracy.

I believe what we have seen is a reinforcement of the class structure in this province in the past number of years as we have never seen before. We have even reinforced it through the tax system. Last year, instead of increasing the progressive income taxes, this government decided it would add to the sales tax and to the OHIP premiums, which affect poor people much more than they affect the wealthy; and it got away with it.

It is nuts to do that. The government has taken the position of bashing its provincial employees instead of helping those in the private sector get back to work. It has decided that punishing the one is better than assisting the other. At the same time that the government has been bashing labour in political terms in this House for being too greedy—at a time when any of the statistics will show that they have not been too greedy in terms of the things they have been asking for—it would not bring in legislation to help in first contracts, which would have helped many people at a lower income level, such as the women at Irwin Toy who receive just slightly more than the minimum wage.

It has done nothing to bring in anti-scab legislation, which again would give some kind of power to people at the bottom of the scale to fight for their rights. The government has done nothing to stop contracting out, which I mentioned the other day and which is destroying the capacity of nursing aides in this province, for instance, to earn an adequate living. The government has done nothing to bring in a justification process for plant closures. All of these are the sorts of things that could reinforce the working people in this province.

The government's major flaw has been in its failure to provide work, its failure to meet what is surely one of its major ethical responsibilities: to make sure that people in this society who wish to work and who are capable of work can get the gratification and financial remuneration from working. It is the failure on the part of the members opposite, as a government, to ensure

that this has taken place, for which it should most assuredly be condemned and to which I address my remarks now in terms of its responsibilities—not as outlined in the vacuous throne speech we have received, which touches nothing of any seriousness, but in terms of the need for a budget that will directly assist people who are in desperate need now of that kind of work.

In a society like ours, which takes personal, physical violence very seriously, we are hypocritical not to look at the kind of structured and accepted unemployment we have, which is just as violent an act against hundreds of thousands of people. This is perpetrated on them by the people who control the means of production in Ontario; and those people are the government, which could put large amounts of money into assisting the poor to allow them to get work.

4:40 p.m.

What we get a lot of talk about is the need to start looking at work-sharing, a shorter work week and all those kinds of things about the notion of the use of leisure. It would be great for those of us who have jobs. In some ways it is already being used by many people who have jobs in the political sphere at this point. But it is of no use at all to those people who are on forced leisure at the moment without any of the sense of self-worth one should get from one's working conditions.

If there were any leadership in this province, we would not talk about the fact that during the recovery a bunch of us are going to do very well and 10 per cent are not going to do well. There would be a systematic plan to make sure that there was an equitable sharing in the recovery and that those who are most severely hurt would be helped the most. Those of us who are already doing quite well, thank you very much, would be given less help and would be asked to pay more of our share.

I have said about as much as I want to say on my own. As part of my frustration with this place and the incapacity to get word out about what some of the real issues are, I have done a number of things in an extraparliamentary fashion to try to attract attention to issues that are of major concern to me.

One of the things I did recently was to place an advertisement in a number of papers in Ontario asking people who were unemployed to write to me about what it was like so I could help them express themselves and be a voice for them to the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) when he came forward with the budget. I thought that

might have more of an influence on him than it obviously had on the federal Minister of Finance.

I have received some coverage for that. The issue has had a bit more talk in the press than it otherwise would have had. I have also done something else. I replied to those people who wrote to me and asked them to write to me a month afterwards to tell me their situation. I again promised them I would read their words into the record of this Legislature.

These people come from all over the province. The members will notice that, because in many cases I will be able to use their names and tell where they were from. No area of this province is immune. None of these people has been identified before in the press. These are all new people who are willing to talk. They want to have their stories told.

The group of letters I have with me today is a small portion. I have received more than 200 replies. In the second group of letters, something like 80 per cent of the people said they were willing to have their names used. It was quite extraordinary.

Six to eight people out of the 200 have received jobs in the month since I talked to them. There was great rejoicing over that in my office. It was like knowing friends of ours were somehow going to get burdens lifted off them. For Vicki Warren it was only a six-month job planting trees. I will say to the member for Renfrew North (Mr. Conway) that Vicki is from Renfrew. For somebody else, it was just a six-month contract doing some editing. Still, it brought to those people hope they had not had before, and we were very pleased to see it. But six to eight is not many when one considers all the work that is supposedly being done out there at the moment in job creation, which we are being told by both the provincial and federal levels of government is so successful.

Before I read some of the letters, I want to say that apart from the letters from people who allowed me to use their names, I would like to read from some who have not allowed me to use their names. Of course, I will not refer to them in that fashion. What I want to show the members is how remarkable it is that anybody would even allow a politician to use his or her name, given the cynicism they feel towards us. I also want to show just how hard and humiliating this whole experience is for them.

This is a letter from a woman in Aurora. It is about six pages. It details the difficulties she and her husband have been having. It ends in this fashion:

"If anyone had told us that we would have been in this position five years ago, I would have never believed them. For all of the hardships to endure, one not to be discounted is the humiliation and embarrassment. Keeping up a brave front. Never letting our friends know that we cannot go out with them because we are penniless. Pretending that we like the heat set at 45 degrees, do not need a phone or new dress or car. Therefore, I must ask you withhold my name and address."

This incredible sense of shame people have because they are unable to find work, and the way it affects their relationships with their family and with their friends, is something which I just do not think we can say enough about in terms of why it is so important for this government to react to these individuals.

Here is another: "Here is my letter concerning the work situation in Timmins. It is very bad. There is no work at all. I have been unemployed for 13 months as a construction worker. All construction projects for this area have been cancelled. Any government work projects will be given to students. We come second. Please wake up the government. Tell them that married men with young children want to work, not have handouts."

One from Toronto: "My unemployment ran out quite a long time ago. Then I had the chance to get a log truck, but I had to get a loan from the bank. Of course, when I bought the log truck there was lots of work. But things went sour. No one was doing any building; so no one needed lumber. Therefore, the mills did not need any logs. Now the bank has the truck."

"In the small town north of here where I was working with the truck I was also buying a house. After I lost the truck I was able to keep the house by doing part-time work in a garage. But then I got laid off from there in September and lost the house."

"I am looking for work in a garage as an apprentice mechanic as I have worked in garages for most of my working life, but I will take any kind of work right now. I am living on welfare right now, or at least existing."

This one from Stoney Creek: "Since coming to this country in 1966, I was continuously employed until August of last year, when I was laid off. I then applied for UIC benefits for the first time in my life. Although I have contributed fully to the UIC scheme over the years, and although I am able and willing to work, I have not received a penny in UIC benefits. Since

August I have supported my family from my savings. Some welfare state."

"At the age of 51 I find myself without a job, with no prospect of finding one in the foreseeable future, and without any form of government support, despite the high levels of taxation that I have been obliged to pay for many years. A swift descent into poverty seems to await me if I remain in Canada. The moral would appear obvious."

The last paragraph is very angry and I will not read it, because I have some others later that will express it in even more articulate terms than this gentleman was able to do.

"I have been unemployed for two years," writes a young man from Welland, "since I graduated from high school in 1981. I have been going to every possible place looking for a job, but it is useless. My father is the only one working in my family. My mother cannot work because she is deaf. I have a sister who is attending high school who is also unemployed. It is becoming harder and harder for my father to support us. I am 20 years old. I should have a job to help out my family. I know you must be hearing this a lot of times, but please give me some advice."

This one is from a woman in Scarborough: "My son, Robert, has been out of work for 16 months. He is a skilled tradesman, a home appliance serviceman. Could you tell him if there will be any work for his trade soon?"

In all these letters there is a real despair and a lack of belief that things could be as they are here in Canada with all the resources we have. These people, as one can tell from the emotion in the letters, are hurting a great deal.

This one is perhaps as poignant as any. It is a very short letter from a fellow who is now living in Kingston. "I went west to find a job. I met a lady. We now have four children, ages six to four months. My unemployment ran out February 5, 1983. I have search for over one year for a job. On February 16, 1983, we separated. I came back home. My wife put my kids in foster care. I here by myself. I miss them and I love them very much."

4:50 p.m.

Here is a letter from Concord: "On May 2 of this year, I will turn 25 and thus not be eligible for youth employment projects; so I will be back on my own. Surely there must exist a job in which a university education will be of benefit."

This one is a little bit longer, but it is an incredibly moving letter from Toronto: "Where things are so bad that a 24-year-old would ever

contemplate ending it all, then we are in a sorer state than we are willing to admit.

"No, my head is screwed on right, thanks. I am not crazy for thinking to kill myself. I am probably one of the most well-adjusted, down-to-earth people I know. This crap about people who think suicide is for neurotics or loonies is exactly that: crap. When a man who is strong and healthy has to go to the Salvation Army for a \$7 food voucher because towards the end of the month he feels dizzy from a lack of food, well."

I will skip a paragraph. "Allow me to be blunt for a moment. I even know a couple of young guys who sell their bodies for money and feel lucky because they do not have to claim it to welfare." This probably goes beyond the bounds of good taste, Mr. Speaker, and I will not go on because of the presence of the pages. He ends up by saying, "So you see, they are worse off than myself when they do not even care about their own physical being."

When we consider that this is a person who is considering suicide and talks about friends who have been selling their bodies for money to supplement their inadequate welfare, the last part seems a little strange in comparison.

"Now I come to the real depressing part. I have a front tooth that is in desperate need of repair or I will lose it, and one or two more. Welfare allows you \$75 a year for a dentist, which I used \$68 of in May of last year; so I cannot even get any dental work done for at least a month and I know it will be more than \$75. So what can I do? Can you even imagine what a 24-year-old will look like with a front tooth missing? I am sure it will depress me to the point I will never be able to get a job and doubt I would anyway. Who wants a toothless employee where you work with the public?"

This is the state we have brought a 24-year-old to in this country, because of a lack of willingness to understand that it is important to put money into job creation for these people. It is important not just to say we are going to put money in but also to increase the deficit to do it and not to hide behind the fact that this is necessary. What is more important, that we increase the deficit and cause ourselves some credit rating crumbling perhaps, or that we leave people in this province feeling as if there is nothing here for them at all? For a government with any moral strength at all, the choice would be clear.

This is a letter from Jim Burkitt from Belleville. It raises some of the problems he has in believing that anything is going to be done.

"In this age of enlightened self-interest, I do not suppose we can expect a great deal of support from the people that have made it. This is not disillusionment particularly, just disappointment, more acrid by the insularity of our modern lives. We are all entangled by the degree of circumstance in human relations. The pain of dull despair and of boredom or wasted possibilities and talents has to be experienced in order for it to be very personal."

What I am trying to do is to make us all experience that today and hope the message gets through to this government before it is too late for these people. I just do not believe it is possible that we can accept the notion that we should have this kind of unemployment for the next four to five years and that the government is suggesting people should be going through this for that length of time.

A startling array of people have written. There is a letter from Doris Alleyne of Waterloo. Her husband, an assistant professor of social anthropology, lost his job in 1979. She says: "I managed to get a job in Zellers department store in Waterloo and when the store closed last July, I lost my job. I was laid off on June 30 and have not been able to find work since, although I have tried hard."

"I saw my husband's morale sink deeper and deeper during his two-year job search. Then he could not take it any longer and in September 1981, he left for Trinidad, (where he was born) hoping to find work there. It was not easy for him to adjust to living conditions there, since he has spent most of his life in Canada. He finally managed to get a part-time teaching position, but the cost of living in Trinidad is very high and it was almost impossible for him to send enough money to provide the bare minimum to his family."

"For the past few years, we have lived on less than half of what is considered the poverty line. We have two sons. One has just turned 16 and the other is 20 years of age. I cannot leave Canada to join my husband, because my 16-year-old is in high school and there is no way he could fit into the Trinidad school system."

"Also, we all consider Canada our home and love this country. I think the fact I am here in our home gives my husband the feeling that Canada is not lost to him. In other words, there is a place to come home to."

"My husband has a PhD and is also a very practical person who can handle many different jobs. Can you honestly tell me there is no job in this country for a man like him?"

What an incredible, horrible irony that somebody has to go to what is called an underdeveloped country to get work because he cannot find the proper employment here in this country.

A letter from Hamilton, from Ellis Browning. It is to do with the kinds of things families have to do to consolidate and stick together. It answers specific questions I had in my letter.

"1. No, I have not yet got a job.

"2. I have not applied for make-work projects. I must confess it is something about which I know nothing about. I would be pleased for details.

"3. I mentioned in my previous letter that Brian Charlton was supporting an application for rehousing. This has gone ahead rapidly and new accommodation had been offered. However, in this short time, further ill luck has befallen the family and my older daughter's husband has become a victim of a layoff. My wife and I feel it is incumbent upon us to help them in whatever manner we can. As they have a spare room available, we have decided to pool resources and move in with them. We are reluctant to do this retrograde thing, but consolidation seems the wiser step in the event, with the hope that the need will be a short term."

From a letter from Heather Yettey of Sudbury, I will just read the postscript.

"Ask Mr. Miller what I say to my little girl when she needs a new baseball glove or money for swimming lessons. All her friends are involved and she cannot, because there is not enough money."

The mother is living on welfare, looking for work.

A letter from Royston Earl in Don Mills, Toronto. He is a person who is unable to receive welfare because of his particular marital status, but to leave that alone:

"I also found out last week through Manpower that because I am not on welfare or unemployment insurance, I am not on the priority list regarding work in the government job creation programs which I have inquired into.

"I asked a Manpower counsellor if I existed at all. 'Oh, yes, you are class two,' was the answer. 'Unfortunately, by the time we come around to class two, the jobs will be taken.'"

This is a man who has been unemployed for three and a half years.

Patricia Wright has a story about one of the course fiascos that are out there all the time now in terms of retraining.

"I received your letter today. Your timing is

perfect. I just got off the phone from the Canada Manpower office at 4900 Yonge Street. The call I made was regarding an ad in Sunday's Sun, April 10, for a new program, a food service and bartending course. It starts April 18, 1983, for 20 weeks.

"I phoned to enrol instead of going to 4900 Yonge, because I had no bus fare to get there. When I finally got through to someone, they told me I would have to make an appointment with a counsellor. The earliest appointment she had to offer was May 25, six weeks after the course started. I had no choice but to accept the date."

From a man named Richard Ott of Mississauga, who went for a job interview:

"I had one job interview which I believe is part of the job creation program. I am not sure if I am going to get the job as there were other applicants after the same job. It is only a temporary job for six months, but is better than nothing, because maybe by then it will be easier to obtain a permanent position." This is a typed letter, but by the time he had finished typing it he had to write a postscript. "Mr. Johnston, would you believe that yesterday I was informed that I was too old for the position mentioned herewith? I am 25 years old. The job is for 18-to-24-year-olds; and that is after two interviews, to learn of the age limit."

5 p.m.

Here is somebody from Lambeth with the same kind of problem, talking about her husband: Monica and Russell Clark. She is talking about the course Russell took: "The course he took was sponsored by Canada Manpower and paid for by UIC benefits. In our area the course was taught at Fanshawe College. There were 25 people in his classes. It was to be a co-op course with eight months in school, an eight-month work term, and a final four months in school. However, when the eight-month work term came about, not one person could find a job to go to. As a result, the students were allowed to return to the school to complete the course. The government retraining programs have become a costly farce."

I cannot tell members the number of letters I received saying that sort of thing. I have limited time, so I will skip over some others, not because they are not important, but because I do not have the luxury of being able to read them all to the members, although I would love to. This has been a very depressing experience for me and my staff, and it has really brought

home to me the human consequences of the failure in economic policy.

Carmen Leduc, who is now living in Markstay but moved there from Sault Ste. Marie: "My husband and I moved from Sault Ste. Marie when he was still receiving UIC benefits. At that time we could no longer afford the \$350 one-room apartment we were renting. We moved to this place, although it was like a barn and used to store junk. We lived in this place and paid rent for some time, without plumbing, carrying the water from my parents. We have made this place livable by putting boards on the cement floor, plastic in the broken windows, and borrowed a small oil space heater to help the wood stove heat this uninsulated shack. Now our landlord tells us that he has someone willing to give him one and a half times the rent we are paying for this place and we are going to be forced to leave even that accommodation." I have a similar letter from Markstay from William Lecky.

Here is a guy named Donald Lauric from Kirkland Lake. This one paragraph strikes home to me in terms of what we are about as a province. "I was born and raised in Kirkland Lake and love to stay here but, if it comes down to it, I may have to sell my house and move somewhere else, perhaps even out of the country, in order to find work. As far as going on welfare, I don't relish the thought; perhaps it is my pride, but it would be my last possible resort."

Then there is a fellow from Thunder Bay who talks about running out of toilet paper and having to go and get some from a local restaurant. Another letter from Thunder Bay comes from Wayne Hutsul: "As for employment, nil. Present economic conditions make it difficult for the shoulder-of-the-road sweeper in search for empty deposit bottles. In fact, I found \$10 in empties last weekend which helped to supplement my welfare income of last month of \$128."

Judith Foell, who has recently moved to Kitchener from London, talks about the reality of what is out there in terms of jobs: "About 80 per cent of the positions offered on CFPL Channel 10 London pay \$3.50 to \$4. an hour. One day on this TV station a position was advertised as collections clerk. I phoned and was asked if I had any experience asking or collecting money. Since I did not, they would not consider me. The next day I happened to be at UIC and just for the fun of it I inquired again about the collections clerk position. It turned out it was an escort service. I asked Manpower

what I was supposed to collect, money or men. She said it was a type of dating service. I was really ticked off. I am sure you can understand my frustration."

Brian Pattison of Hamilton: "I have been out every morning about 7:30 a.m. to fill applications for different jobs, and I have decided to offer two weeks' free labour or skills to any company that will offer me a chance to join their company."

This is from a woman who left Kingston to move to Ottawa. She is 30 years old, single, university-educated: "When I moved to Ottawa from Kingston in 1980, I was fortunate to find a reasonably priced apartment in an older house in an industrial park in the west end of the city.

"With what I receive from welfare, a single person's stipend of \$303 monthly, minus my part-time earnings, and what I get working six to eight hours a week for \$3 an hour as a waitress, I have managed to sustain the necessities. I find it a strain though because most of my earnings are deducted from the base figure.

"A single person is allowed to earn \$50 extra a month and then 75 cents is subtracted from each succeeding dollar. It seems that the more I work, the more I lose. For instance, in September I was sent a benefit cheque for six cents. If it were not for gratuities, an unstable and unpredictable amount at best, I would not be able to eat on a regular basis. It helps that I work as a waitress as I can eat the leftovers from customers' plates or scrounge in the kitchen as long as the manager does not see."

Michael MacIntosh of Thunder Bay writes, "Just one final note on unemployment benefits: While earning \$4 an hour at a ski resort, I now look forward to receiving \$87 a week, compliments of unemployment. Could you live on that?"

There is another case. Jack Armstrong from Sudbury also talks about having to subsidize his unemployment insurance benefits with welfare. When we have make-work projects for people with low incomes and expect them to be on a project for some 26 weeks so they can requalify, we have to understand they will be back not only on unemployment, but on welfare as well because the unemployment will not cover them adequately.

Amelia Allidone of St. Catharines is single with three children. "The only difference between my last letter and this is the fact that my frustration continues to grow with every turn-down I receive. It is coming to the point where I

will accept any job at any rate as long as I can find steady employment."

These letters go on and on. There are some from people who are obviously incredibly uneducated. Those members who think technological changes in our society are going to make a new nirvana for people must understand there is no place for these people in that technological revolution. We have to find other answers for them.

We must not say these people, a lot of them in their fifties, are going to be going on and off unemployment insurance for the next number of years because of the way the economy is going. We must not say: "That is all there is to it. We cannot do anything." The government must set as its priority the matter of trying to obtain full employment. We cannot accept this notion that eight or 10 per cent unemployment is what we are going to live with. It is unthinkable.

My time is nearly up. I want to read one letter from Toronto which I found very upsetting because it brings in some racist things. It is understandable people want to turn around and lash out at others when they find themselves without. There is a dangerous mood developing out there. Leaving this to brew will cause this society no end of trouble.

He lists the things he has been doing. "Article in *Globe and Mail*: '371 Jobs Created by Council.' These jobs were for unskilled labour. I was told, 'You do not qualify.' Three: Make-work project involving painting of hostels, etc., 'You do not qualify.' Four: Roman Catholic Archdiocese renovation project, 'Not available.'

"Maybe I should be an immigrant or a refugee or a francophone or some other qualifying minority. Maybe I should not be an adult. Adults do not seem to matter much in today's society. Ontario, Metro Toronto and Ottawa have all undertaken the task of employing youth. Now the federal budget, hah; more jobs for youth and nothing but the proverbial finger for adults.

"As for your question of permission to use my name, please do. My marriage is gone. I no longer have my children. I don't qualify. I am slowly starving to death. I may as well go on the RCMP's hit list as well.

"Regrettably yours, Paul D. Le Poidevin."

What are we doing? What are we breeding in our society when we say these people are to stew like this for the next number of years? If this government had any moral strength or any sense of leadership other than just the image

leadership we have seen, we would have had a speech from the throne which would have spoken about that challenge. It would have spoken about the need to put massive amounts of money into job creation, into structural change in our economy so we could get control of it. It would have spoken about a protection of workers' rights in plant closings and of the need for a major stimulation of the housing industry.

It would have said, "We will cause a deficit to do this because it is morally necessary to do this. We cannot put these people on the chopping block just because it is easy to do."

5:10 p.m.

If this government does not react now and bring in a budget that does this, then I would suggest to them that there is going to be open warfare in this House; that all the niceties of the boys' club we have here should be thrown aside, because this should not be a debating society when people are suffering like this; and that any government that sits and lets them suffer and any opposition that does not do everything in its power to make the government react is not worth its salt.

By God, I pledge myself to harass this government like the devil if they do not come through with some major response to the human tragedies that exist in this province today.

Mr. Mitchell: Mr. Speaker, I unfortunately cannot be as negative as the honourable member opposite when he made the comment a few moments ago that there is no room in the so-called high-tech area for the uneducated, because just a short couple of weeks ago a representative of a company in Ottawa-Carleton talked to me about a program he currently has going in which he has used such people, brought them into his firm and is working an apprenticeship program. I understand that he intends to try to continue that program.

Mr. Laughren: Is that the general rule out there?

Mr. Mitchell: No, I will grant you it is not a general rule, but the attempt is being made there.

I would like to go on and support, if I may, the comments made by the member for Carleton East (Mr. MacQuarrie), who enunciated his feeling for the need for a ministry of science and technology. Of course, the member for Carleton East and I, coming from Ottawa-Carleton, have seen the gigantic growth of all of those companies in the high-tech field. We see what

they have to offer now and what they will have to offer, but also we see what can be there with the proper government support.

I should point out as well that I feel that a ministry of science and technology would perhaps be more directly able to liaise with the education system—and I am obviously speaking of the Ottawa-Carleton area—because companies there have told me they require not the engineers we are so used to seeing but the engineering technologists.

People at the community college level have told me they have a problem meeting that need. The problem is not totally provincial; they themselves have to look very seriously at the courses they offer and see where the demand is. In this regard, the demand for community college positions is growing; it is growing in those areas where the high-tech companies need employees.

Years ago when I was going to school it used to be that when parents were talking among themselves and one would say, "My John is going to university;" the parent whose youngster was going to a community college said so with his head bowed; but that is not the case today.

About a year ago, the area of Ottawa-Carleton, and particularly those high-tech firms in the municipality of Kanata, had an open house over one weekend when most of the firms there opened their doors wide for families to come out. And the interest was there. It was most amazing to see these families walking together among the Mitels, the Spars, the Norpaks and all of these firms that have grown so rapidly in Ottawa-Carleton; they went there with interest, with the idea in mind that maybe this was the direction in which their children would look for their goals in life.

Similarly, there have been two high-tech shows in the Ottawa-Carleton area, and those high-tech shows outdrew on a per-capita basis those that have been held in the famous Silicon Valley south. So the interest is there.

I see this ministry of science and technology perhaps being a subministry of the Ministry of Industry and Trade. I would not want to prejudge how it would best be handled, but specifically I see it dealing with industry and with education to make sure that the community colleges are able to meet what are seen as the goals and so the community colleges know what firms are going to be opening up in the area and what types of employment will be necessary.

I see this ministry as being there specifically to deal with those industries that are looking for government assistance, the companies that are coming in and saying, "We are prepared to go with 200 new jobs." These are not jobs moving around between the industry, but 200 new jobs, if the support is there for them to get that on the rails.

I support wholeheartedly the member for Carleton East. I have put that particular support in writing. It would be my sincere hope that ministry would be created to meet those challenges out there; and also the challenges in the technology transfer the member for Carleton East spoke about.

We have a gold mine, albeit a federal agency, in Ottawa that has worked very carefully and very closely with industries in Ontario. That is something we should be promoting, that continued relationship between the province and the National Research Council.

I would like to continue by making a few comments on agriculture. In the riding of Carleton, we still have some agricultural resources being actively farmed, and very well farmed.

Included in the throne speech was the government's view that farmers should be protected from the loss of their products, either when another business fails or through misrepresentations of a buyer. In particular, upcoming changes to the Grain Elevator Storage Act were mentioned. These will include better protection for farmers who store their farm produce in elevators.

The term "grain elevator" understates the scope of the act because it includes beans, cereal grains, corn and grass seeds produced in Ontario.

Mr. Laughren: You have not even put a food terminal in Timmins yet.

Mr. Mitchell: Come on now, Floyd. Don't tell any lies about us and we won't tell the truth about you.

We can all appreciate that if an elevator operator goes bankrupt or becomes insolvent, legal proceedings can take years. This can cause considerable hardship to a producer who has stored his produce in that elevator. The current act already gives the chief inspector certain powers to protect the property of producers of materials stored at grain elevators where the licence of the grain elevator operator has not been reviewed or has been suspended or revoked.

This government's plan to amend the act will make it clear that farm produce held in an

elevator for storage remains the property of the producer unless that producer has been paid previously. As the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Timbrell) has already stated, the aim is simply to ensure justice by protecting the farmer's property rights. The envisaged changes will further protect the producer in sales transactions by ensuring the owner retains title to the grain until payment is actually made.

There is considerable support for these changes in the farming community at the level of both the producers' marketing boards and the Ontario Grain and Feed Dealers Association. Therefore, I look forward to this revision of the act and its speedy passage through this chamber. By helping producers in such areas as storage, we also come closer to meeting our goals to increase exports and reduce our own imports.

It is interesting to note as a very positive step that the construction of such storage facilities as has recently occurred has been made possible by assistance from the Board of Industrial Leadership and Development.

As the storage facilities are completed and are put into use, we will have to build and improve our already effective measures to market Ontario products offshore. With these storage facilities and the new technology for storage, it will be possible to store Ontario produce for longer periods. As a result, this produce will then become available for either export or the domestic market rather than lying in a field and being lost due to poor market demand at the time.

5:20 p.m.

None of us has to be sold on the quality of Ontario produce, but we have to recognize the limitations of the growing season here in our province. Our growing season results in harvests for a particular product over a period of a few weeks, effectively flooding the market in some instances but not being sold in others.

In other words, even though we may grow enough of a particular crop, we still have problems making it available over a longer period of time. Better and increased storage facilities will go a long way to keeping Ontario food on the shelves of stores throughout Ontario and for a longer period.

While my constituency is becoming more and more urban, the issues concerning food and farmers should rightly involve us all. I would therefore like to concentrate my remaining remarks on another of our throne speech commitments in the area of agriculture.

Because food is important to us, I welcomed

the initiative of the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Timbrell) to establish a national tripartite stabilization program to protect our producers against potentially disastrous fluctuations in commodity prices. This initiative is particularly welcome in the light of the federal Agriculture minister's inability to find funding for Ottawa's long-promised red meat plan. In my view, the program being worked on by Ontario and Saskatchewan would still be preferable because it would be available to all producers who want to participate.

Since last summer's meeting of federal and provincial agriculture ministers, there has been general agreement that we need a national farm income stabilization program. The challenge of developing the operational details for a national program can be enormous, but we face a time when the survival of many farms depends on establishing price stability for many farm commodities. A national program would also be easier to run than 10 totally separate provincial schemes, each operating with different criteria and only for certain commodities.

Other than the costs imposed, the drawbacks of individual provincial programs lie in support levels being set that give producers in one province an advantage over those elsewhere. In effect, provinces end up in a form of nonproductive competition between producers in one province and provincial governments in other provinces. Only two recognized approaches exist for producers to control fluctuating farm incomes: supply management and stabilization.

Supply management is a useful technique for many producers, provided, of course, that producers are willing to enter into a fairly structured system and conform to its rules, such as setting quotas. Currently in Canada, about one third of our farm producers are covered by supply management arrangements.

Income stabilization programs are the other option. The federal government has had an income stabilization program since 1958 which, in spite of changes, is no longer considered adequate. As a result, provincial programs have also been established in most provinces with the different levels of support that I mentioned earlier. Not only has this been costly, but the interests of producers and consumers have not been served as well as they could be.

Stabilization programs basically work like insurance, with the participants paying the premiums. Stabilization programs guarantee farmers a floor price for their product. In the case of the proposed program, the national

program would put a floor under the prices the farmers would receive in the marketplace. The method of establishing the floor price is one of the more difficult problems which will have to be dealt with.

It has to be set high enough so that farmers do not suffer major losses, but it has to be low enough so that farmers are not encouraged to overproduce. Once set, though, the participating producer will be able to plan ahead with a reasonable knowledge of what the minimum price will be from year to year. In order to eliminate its use for speculation, the national plan would also require agreement on how producers could enter and leave the plan. I expect that particular scenario, however, is only a minor consideration.

Because the plans envisage payment into the program, one third by the province, one third by Ottawa and one third by the producer, co-operation is needed at all these levels. Already a federal-provincial task force has been established to look first at the needs of beef, pork and sheep producers. As other commodities are examined, the means for including them in national stabilization programs can be developed.

Federal-provincial agriculture ministers are expected to meet in Prince Edward Island this July. We may learn then about the prospects for a successful national stabilization proposal. This program, if it goes ahead, will benefit not only producers but consumers as well. The farmer is not the only one to worry about fluctuating prices for his commodity; the consumer also is often bewildered by the availability and pricing of many products.

A good example to use is beef. Whenever there is a large amount of beef on the market, prices fall. With lower returns, farmers decide to cut back, resulting after one or two years in a reduced supply of beef in stores and higher prices for consumers. The higher prices then bring about more production and another oversupply, thereby continuing the cycle.

A stabilization program would even out such variations in supply and pricing and would allow for a steadier financial return to the producer and a steadier supply at a reasonable cost to the consumer.

As an added bonus, indications are that a national program would not be more expensive to the taxpayer than the existing national hotchpotch of stabilization programs that have been established in this country. Governments, in fact, would find it easier since the greater stability in prices and production would allow

more accurate budget planning. This is one of those too-rare moments when provincial governments have joined together on their own, with federal participation, to develop a full national program. It is my hope that this proposal will succeed.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry I missed most of the remarks made by the honourable member who has just concluded speaking. I was busy with my duties on the Board of Internal Economy. Those of you who are driving home tonight will be glad to know there is another cent a kilometre on gas, which of course is long overdue. I thought perhaps I should just mention that.

The Deputy Speaker: How about the clock? Is there anything about the clock?

Mr. Nixon: I appreciate your comment about the new digital clock in here, Mr. Speaker. I should just mention that, contrary to Mr. Hoy's comment earlier this week, I think the digital clock is a very useful addition to this chamber.

All of us who have had an opportunity to observe the Parliament at Westminster will, of course, recall that there are digital clocks in that chamber for the benefit of the members and the observers in the gallery, because the question period is so stylized and structured that the questions are really never answered, or even asked. In our House they are never answered either. It is quite interesting because the topics for questions seem to change as the digits roll over the specific minute, according to the elaborate rules they have governing question period there.

It has also been brought to my attention that the intensity of the colour has been reduced since Friday. I did not notice that myself, but I was assured it had been adjusted over the weekend so that the bright green was somewhat less intrusive. Frankly, I feel it is quite an addition here, and I look forward to the time when some of our other procedures are brought into line with the modern computer age.

Mr. Conway: For example?

Mr. Nixon: I suppose, for example, even our voting procedures, while they are traditional and sometimes quite interesting—even hilarious—still put an unnecessary strain on our capable employees at the table. It seems to me other jurisdictions have found ways to determine the views of the members by their vote a little more quickly and a little more effectively.

Mind you, my wife has already recommended that the utilization of the members of the

Legislature is limited in time anyway, and we will soon have an opportunity for all citizens to take part in the debates and, at least, monitor them through their televisions and simply vote themselves—yes, no, maybe—from the comfort of their own homes, in which case we would have the kind of democracy they have enjoyed in certain obscure cantons of Switzerland since medieval times. Of course, I have assured her that there will always be the necessity of the utilization of this chamber by members such as ourselves, giving the benefit to our colleagues of our views on these important emerging matters.

5:30 p.m.

I am less than impressed by the presence of the ministry this afternoon. As I observe the government side carefully I cannot see a single minister. I see at least four people who should be ministers.

The Deputy Speaker: Wait a minute.

Mr. Nixon: But in the rather unlikely event of that taking place in the near future, I thought I should say so.

Certainly we are on the verge of tremendous changes in the ministry. When Kathy Davis herself says it is her husband's duty to run for the federal leadership of the Progressive Conservative Party, can the decision be far behind?

Mr. Conway: Do you think the member for Mississauga South (Mr. Kennedy) might be Acting Premier?

Mr. Nixon: Could be. Actually, the leader of the New Democratic Party made a telling remark in that connection when he was reported to have said that the Premier (Mr. Davis) was giving indecision a bad name. I thought that was probably quite a good comment.

It now appears from the Toronto Star, which has been about as sycophantic as any newspaper has ever been in political support of an individual, that the Premier is going to make the decision. Whatever happens federally after that we can discuss at some other time, but what is going to happen here is really the interesting thing to which we have to give some consideration.

I thought one of the real giveaways if he does go is the fact that there has been no cabinet change even though the cabinet is in more serious disarray—even chaos—than at any time in the 21 years I have had the opportunity to observe it.

Mr. Conway: Twenty-one years?

Mr. Nixon: It is a long time, but not long enough, as the Premier would say.

It is difficult to go over the cabinet because, looking at the empty seats, I cannot even remember who they are. No doubt they are being driven down to the evening dinner at Winston's, or wherever it is going to happen tonight, with their executive assistants with their credit cards at the ready.

Mr. Conway: The Minister of Health (Mr. Grossman) is in Switzerland.

Mr. Nixon: The Concorde has got to be kept flying somehow, and maybe he can do it single-handed.

I really have felt that there has been a good deal of restraint on the part of the cabinet ministers who consider themselves upwardly mobile; there has been none of this untoward jockeying for position. As a matter of fact, there has been a lot of Alphonse-Gaston bowing and scraping. It is hard to see who is really moving into the fore, although, as members will recall, from time to time members of the opposition parties are prone to give a judgement when an answer is given in the House and so on.

But there is no doubt that with these huge war chests that have been gathered by calling in the faithful to \$200- or \$250-a-plate dinners downtown we are going to be subjected to an even more massive and impressive campaign than the group that gathered at Roy Thomson Hall Saturday afternoon is able to put forward.

Mr. Kolyin: It was Massey Hall.

Mr. Nixon: Was it Massey Hall? Oh yes. You are always second rate. You always miss the real style accomplishments. That's right; I saw it on television. The last time there was a political meeting there I think it was Mackenzie King in 1940.

The Deputy Speaker: No, Diefenbaker was there.

Mr. Nixon: Was he? Oh well, that was a good meeting too.

Frankly, I agree with Kathy Davis. I think it is the Premier's duty to save the Progressive Conservative Party nationally from a fate worse than death. We are all very interested in what is happening there, of course, because the polls indicate that if an election were held now the Liberal Party might not achieve its usual goals of success.

As the Premier used to be willing to bring to my attention from time to time, in the election of 1975 the Liberal Party was a clear 12 per cent ahead of him and somehow or other the election did not work out on the basis of the Gallup predictions. There are those in the front bench

of the party here, Mr. Speaker, who will tell you in private what happened, but we will not give them an opportunity to do so right now.

When we see that lineup of federal contenders, there is always that warm glow that diffuses through our bodies when we see Joe Clark speaking. According to the handicappers in the *Toronto Star*, he is a two-to-one favourite. As a matter of fact, he is my candidate. He is the one most of us on this side would prefer to be elected.

I find the others quite interesting. There was an article in the *Toronto Star* last week in which Keith Davey was reported to have been describing the candidates as similar to our bird friends, referring to the grosbeak from Newfoundland and certain others, which I thought was quite amusing but somewhat unfair, because they are all extremely capable and well committed to the public good.

Having participated in leadership campaigns myself, I know that at about this stage in the federal Tory leadership there are delegates everywhere asking, "Why does someone of stature not come forward?" It is a syndrome in every leadership contest. I have even heard that put to me as a candidate myself, and been expected to commiserate with the poor delegates because they did not have somebody better to vote for. So it is bound to happen.

This will come back to the Premier of Ontario through his rumour network. It has to be the best that has ever been established any time, anywhere, by a politician. There is nothing that happens anywhere in Canada that is not reported to him by one of his friends or employees in the very near future. You may be aware of that yourself, Mr. Speaker, from time to time. You have been involved in events here that were probably reported to the Premier without delay.

The Deputy Speaker: Speaking of that, I should tokenly observe that I am sure somewhere in your dialogue we are getting around to the throne speech.

Mr. Nixon: What could possibly be more appropriate than the leadership of the government of Ontario, particularly when we are talking about the very man who singlehandedly wrote the throne speech? I shall certainly try to abide by your ruling, Mr. Speaker, but I have a feeling that, even with your best efforts, you are not going to get me off this subject.

The Deputy Speaker: I said "tokenly."

Mr. Nixon: I agree with Mrs. Davis. I think it is his duty to run for the leadership of the

Progressive Conservative Party. Actually, it would do him good to sit in opposition in Ottawa for a while. It would do him good to face the leader of the present government there for a little while, because I think it is a completion to a politician's soul to have an experience in opposition. Of course, it is our aim to give that experience to a handful of our friends opposite in the very near future. We are working towards that goal and I believe we are going to be able to achieve it.

The question is whether the Premier has to resign his seat or even the premiership of the province if he declares himself a candidate. We are often told by the cognoscenti that it is not necessary to resign. There are all the antecedents in the Conservative leadership who went for that role without resigning their position. I personally think the Premier's better judgement will prevail and when he goes he will be gone, because there will be no way back. As soon as the decision is made for him to contest the federal office, the floodgate will be unleashed around here and Larry and Moe and all the rest of them will be working very hard for the succession.

5:40 p.m.

I expect he has already whispered in the ear of the Minister of Energy (Mr. Welch) so that he could be persuaded, perhaps against his better judgement, to take over the premiership on an interim basis. He would have to make a commitment, naturally, that he would not be a contestant for the leadership itself.

There have been those who have said that perhaps the present government House leader (Mr. Wells) might be persuaded to become Premier on an interim basis. I, for one, would be very much against that, because I do not believe his options should be restricted in any way. As far as I am concerned, the Minister of Energy would make a great interim Premier and maybe a full-time Premier. He got his background at McMaster, which is not always one of the earmarks of political success, but in his instance I think it would be great if he were to take on the interim responsibility and give the Premier a free hand to move away from the provincial scene and any ties to the provincial scene so he could campaign all out for the federal leadership.

In many respects, if Joe Clark were going to do the right thing in the broad scene of Progressive Conservative politics, he would have been persuaded by now to come to Queen's Park, meet with the Premier and say, "If you are interested in doing this, I will not only step

aside, I will nominate you." After all, without going over all the historical facts associated with that, Mr. Clark has had an opportunity to be Prime Minister. I think it would be unreasonable to assume that a secondary role, actually as the new leader's right-hand man, would be something he should spurn.

Mr. Conway: Somebody has to speak French.

Mr. Nixon: Oh, that is a lovely, lovely comment.

I am quite serious about this. If the people over there had any influence in the Progressive Conservative Party of Canada, and I happen to know they have little or none, they would persuade Joe Clark to get the Premier to go so they would stop tearing themselves apart. They would not have to have this kind of contest. They could anoint him. Joe Clark would be at his right-hand side. Some of them would perhaps remain to make it a fight, but he would go down there as Leader of the Opposition to face his fate.

An hon. member: With Crosbie on his left.

Mr. Nixon: No, Crombie has another destiny. Before the member gets too excited about David Crombie being on his left, it seems to me Crombie is a natural to come back here for the real leadership contest. After all, the member for St. George (Ms. Fish) could run his campaign. What would be better than David Crombie saying: "I am committed to the political life. I have offered myself as leader in Canada and I have fought hard for it. I came fourth out of seven, which is not too bad, but my true love is with the city of Toronto and its extension, the province of Ontario."

I think for the fellows lining up for the provincial leadership there is always a cloud the size of a man's hand in politics and, for those guys, it is Crombie.

Hon. Mr. Wells: What about Darcy McKeough?

Mr. Nixon: Darcy is coming into town tomorrow. I can probably tell the honourable member better on Wednesday morning, because Darcy is meeting with the Liberals. I do not know what his idea is, but maybe he is thinking the future belongs to a rather broader view of politics. He was never narrow in his approach.

Mr. Conway: On your primary thesis, you seem to have forgotten why Maureen McTeer, like Tom Wells, supported Bert Lawrence 11 years ago.

Mr. Nixon: Oh, I had forgotten. Thank God for the member for Renfrew North. He does not forget anything. He does not learn anything, but

he does not forget anything. In that he is with the Bourbons. That is unfair.

Mr. Conway: Do you remember what Maureen said about Bill Davis in 1971?

Mr. Nixon: I would like him to tell us what Maureen said about the Premier.

The Deputy Speaker: It is rough enough as it is. How am I going to explain this to the second floor, to the guy in the corner office?

Mr. Nixon: If the Premier decides to go, I expect there will be a lot of blood on the floor. There is no doubt about that. Joe Clark should step aside but I have a feeling, having watched his career with care, he is not going to do that.

As soon as the Premier of Ontario's candidacy is established, he will have an opportunity to go across Canada with Joe Clark on the same platform and explain just where he was during the election of 1980, when he was in Fort Lauderdale for part of it, and why it was the Liberal Party actually used excerpts from the provincial budget, approved by the Premier and read by the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller), that were so destructive as far as Joe Clark's government and his budget at that time happened to be.

The real action we are going to get on the Davis candidacy is going to come from the west. I used to hear that the Premier of Alberta would run if the Premier of Ontario ran. I now hear he has stepped down from that a little bit; he just has not got the energy, but he is probably going to participate in a rather flamboyant way in expressing his view that there is something inadequate with the energy and other policies of central Ontario, as stated by the Premier of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Wells: He will nominate him.

Mr. Nixon: It has been mentioned by the government House leader that probably Lougheed would nominate him. If they really wanted to do the right thing, and this is advice from somebody who has their interests at heart, they should get Joe Clark to nominate him and the Premier of Alberta to second him; then they could go out and say, "Don't say we are not united in this."

That is the thing to do. The others would fall by the wayside. They would probably get on the bandwagon, looking forward, in the unlikely event that the new leader were successful in winning the government of Canada, to having certain places of importance and maybe even preferment. That is the way it could happen. Opposition parties often cannot organize them-

selves that well, with the exception of the official opposition in Ontario, which of course is well organized and which has never experienced those difficulties.

Now we come back to what is going to happen here. One thinks right now of all the little groups meeting in the law offices downtown, just slaving over the succession here in Ontario. What happens in Ottawa is one thing, but this is where it is at, according to some of our friends opposite.

I do not know. I made a quick list: the member for Muskoka (Mr. F. S. Miller), the member for Eglinton (Mr. McMurtry), the member for St. Andrew-St. Patrick (Mr. Grossman), the member for London South (Mr. Walker), the member for York East (Mr. Elgie), the member for Don Mills (Mr. Timbrell), the member for Scarborough North (Mr. Wells).

Mr. Kolyn: Bette Stephenson.

Mr. Nixon: The member for York Mills (Miss Stephenson) maybe. She ought to run, but I do not think she will. I think the government members have probably run her, she being a very tough and capable minister, through the wringer so often on the fine legislation she has presented that she probably figures she has had enough of it.

I have to add to that list—he is not really a dark horse; I would think he might even be the front runner—Crombie.

We do not know how that is going to be set up, but the government will be operated by Premier Welch. That sounds quite good. We are going to make that Kemp-Welch actually. He has a hyphenated name, and there is something about Kemp-Welch that has got a little more class. It can really happen; Premier Kemp-Welch will operate things here.

The budget will be like the throne speech, with not very much in it; maybe small increases of certain taxes, but very little of anything. It is going to be a stand-pat budget, as somebody said, dropped into amber so that nothing is happening, and the real battle will be under way. Some time late in September, maybe even about the middle of September, this will be settled and we will have a new Premier.

If there is a new Premier here—and if any of this comes true, there certainly will be—then I think we would be facing an election, my fellow members.

Mr. Conway: Oh, no.

Mr. Nixon: I can hardly wait.

Mr. Ruston: There are signs already.

Mr. Nixon: That is right. I would not even mind a winter election, but I would think some time next spring. This could happen. It will really depend on what sort of response the new Premier gets.

I would just say, from my own experience in leadership campaigns, the time to get organized is now. Those guys on the back benches who have been sitting there with the Premier not even remembering their names since the last election might as well pick their candidate, which will really kind of lay out their careers for the next 15 years. But I say to them, do not make a mistake; pick a winner.

Mr. Conway: Tom Wells didn't pick the winner.

Mr. Nixon: We can see what happened to him.

This is the time for them to pick their candidate and really make a commitment. They should not sit on the fence to see who is going to win. They should just be sure they pick a person they can work with, who they think is going to have a role to play in the remaining few months of the Conservative regime in Ontario, and they might get a very good shadow cabinet position when they are over here. That is worth pushing for.

5:50 p.m.

I felt I ought to give this kind of advice to some of the members present. I will not be participating as a delegate in that particular selection, but I have offered and will continue to offer my advice to both the front and back benches of the Tory party. They do not follow it, but they will eventually come around to realizing that my advice is correct in this. The time for action is now, particularly for the back-benchers. If they sit there waiting for the winner to look at them, then they are not playing the game properly. They should pick their person and get him or her elected. That is the way the system works.

Mr. Conway: What about the member for Wilson Heights (Mr. Rotenberg)? What is your advice for him?

Mr. Nixon: I do not know, but I understand the retirement age on the Ontario Municipal Board is 65, and we may have a Liberal candidate in that riding who will clean his clock—

Mr. Rotenberg: You have not been able to yet.

Mr. Nixon: Well, my friend has not run against this guy. I suggest one of the things he

might do is extend the active age on the municipal board to about 80 and then he will be okay.

Mr. Rotenberg: Are you going to run in my riding?

Mr. Nixon: No, no. I have enough trouble in Brant-Oxford-Norfolk.

Speaking of that, there are one or two items I want to bring to the members' attention having to do, if not with my constituency, at least with problems that are evident there and shared by other constituencies. I want to speak very briefly about White Farm Equipment Co.

We in this Legislature have supported White Farm Equipment to the extent of about \$7 million—\$2 million in an outright grant and about \$5 million in guarantees. The government of Canada has been even more generous, making available \$11 million.

This company was sold to American interests about a year ago under circumstances that make an interesting story. I am not going to take time to tell it since we have discussed it in this Legislature before. The result was that the Canadian partner was bought out by American interests—given \$1.5 million to get out of the way. It was wholly taken over by an American entrepreneur about a year ago.

At a public meeting in Brantford about a week ago, it was predicted by the New Democratic Party federal member that White would go into receivership within a few days or a very few weeks. This may or not happen, but I am sure it is a fact that White Farm Equipment is facing extremely difficult financial trials and tribulations.

They have not made a combine for something like 15 months and although their combine is considered to be one of the best, if not the best on the market, it is still difficult to sell since farmers do not want to buy a \$100,000 item made by a company that may or may not be in business in the next few weeks. One can understand that.

When I went into the local White Farm Equipment dealer today to buy a couple of cultivator points, I was interested to note that there was a letter up there from the president of White Farm Equipment reassuring the dealership that their refinancing in the United States had been established and that they were confident the same sort of stability would be available in Canada.

It is interesting that governments at both levels have been somewhat more generous—even on a per capita basis, if that phrase

applies—to Massey-Ferguson than they have been to White Farm Equipment. It is hoped the governments will continue to tide these companies over the next few months as farm prosperity, we hope and pray, regains some more momentum.

I should point out something the farm members are well aware of about the price of some of our products. Soybeans and corn particularly have gone ahead by 25 to 40 per cent in the past two months. This has been largely because of an initiative of the government of the United States which has resulted in reducing the acreage to be planted this year by about 20 per cent.

The US government has a very imaginative program called the payment in kind program. Farmers who make a commitment not to grow certain acres in corn and beans this year, corn particularly, have an agreement from the US government that they will receive not dollars, but the corn, free, that would have been grown on that acreage. This corn was bought by the government to maintain the price last year and has been in storage at high expense all this time.

Thus, the US government, without contributing—that is, it is not handing out dollars—is reducing its storage charge and giving the farmers corn in return for a promise not to plant the acres this year. This means the net crop will be reduced, and certain controls in that way will be advantageous to the American farmers. We in Canada get the advantage of this without participating in any way, and the price, as I have said, has gone up as much as 35 per cent in certain markets for corn, which is a good thing for us. As Canadians we tend to think of ourselves as really being an important part of the world market in grain, but we should remember that all of Canada produces only three per cent of the grain produced in the world; the state of Iowa grows more grain than all of Canada. It tends to give you a certain, let us say, factual basis when you are discussing this thing; I would not say humility. Instead of being sort of the breadbasket for the hungry world, we are not much more than simply an ancillary market, which must follow the American lead in the sale of corn, soybeans and other farm products to the world market.

This world market is expanding; there is no doubt about that. The population growth figures are familiar to all of us and to some extent are quite frightening. It is unfortunate that the population growth is largely in those parts of the world where the economy is extremely depressed and there is very little opportunity for those

countries to participate in the world grain market in a way that is advantageous for them or for us.

But the prospects are improving for the farmers, particularly in the grain market, although the depression, particularly in the red meat business, is so serious in Ontario that we find our farmers who are engaged in that particular enterprise facing continued economic stress and a growing number of bankruptcies.

White Farm Equipment continues in operation. The minister, in answer to my question a week ago, indicated the government of Ontario is in no way dealing with the ownership of the company at present to maintain its operation. I intend to ask the minister further about this, since there is some indication the financing of the company is on a better basis, and we hope it can continue.

We must remember that even at the level of the economy four years ago there were 1,000

people employed in Brantford in the manufacture of these axial-flow combines, tractors and other equipment, and that for the past many months there has been only a caretaker staff available and a small group of people serving the dealership requirements.

There is no question that the quality of the implements is good and that the axial-flow combine itself is one of the best in the world. It would be a shame indeed if the ability and the technology to produce this combine were lost to Canada, and although we have an assurance from the company now owning White Farm Equipment that the technology will be maintained here, still in economic extremis the loss of that technology is a real possibility.

On motion by Mr. Nixon, the debate was adjourned.

The House adjourned at 6 p.m.

CONTENTS

Monday, May 2, 1983

Statement by the ministry

Wiseman, Hon. D. J., Minister of Government Services:	
Access to government facilities.	351
Oral questions	
Birch, Hon. M., Provincial Secretary for Social Development:	
Extendicare Ltd. , Mr. Rae, Mr. McClellan.	356
Extra billing , Mr. McClellan.	358
Drea, Hon. F., Minister of Community and Social Services:	
Education for mentally handicapped , Mr. Laughren.	360
Elgie, Hon. R. G., Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations:	
Price restraint criteria , Mr. Swart.	361
Mechanics' Lien Act practices , Mr. Breaugh, Mr. Sweeney.	362
McCaffrey, Hon. B., Minister of Citizenship and Culture:	
Funding by Wintario , Mr. O'Neil.	362
Library boards , Mr. Boudria.	363
Miller, Hon. F. S., Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics:	
Suncor earnings , Mr. Peterson.	353
Ramsay, Hon. R. H., Minister of Labour:	
Weiler report , Mr. Peterson, Mr. Rae, Mr. Wrye.	352
Weiler report , Mr. Rae, Mr. Wrye, Mr. Martel.	355
Buy Canadian policy , Mr. Peterson.	357
Taylor, Hon. G. W., Solicitor General:	
Deaths at Hospital for Sick Children , Ms. Copps, Mr. McClellan.	358
Walker, Hon. G. W., Minister of Industry and Trade:	
Foreign Investment Review Agency , Mr. Sweeney, Mr. Rae.	358
Wiseman, Hon. D. J., Minister of Government Services:	
St. Clair Region Conservation Authority , Mr. Van Horne.	361

Petitions

Nuclear disarmament , Mr. Eakins, tabled.	363
Bulk foods , Mr. Pollock, tabled.	364

Motion

Private members' public business , Mr. Wells, agreed to.	364
---	-----

First reading

Borough of East York Act , Bill Pr6, Mr. Williams, agreed to.	364
--	-----

Throne speech debate

Mr. MacQuarrie.	364
--------------------------------	-----

Mr. Ruston.	368
Mr. R. F. Johnston.	374
Mr. Mitchell.	382
Mr. Nixon.	385

Other business

Legislative pages, Mr. Speaker.	351
Article in newspaper, Mr. Kerrio.	351
Visitors, Mr. Speaker.	352
Notice of dissatisfaction, Mr. Laughren.	363
Budget day procedure, Mr. Wells.	364
Adjournment.	391

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Birch, Hon. M., Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Scarborough East PC)
 Boudria, D. (Prescott-Russell L)
 Breauth, M. J. (Oshawa NDP)
 Breithaupt, J. R. (Kitchener L)
 Conway, S. G. (Renfrew North L)
 Copps, S. M. (Hamilton Centre L)
 Cureatz, S. L., Deputy Speaker and Chairman (Durham East PC)
 Drea, Hon. F., Minister of Community and Social Services (Scarborough Centre PC)
 Eakins, J. F. (Victoria-Haliburton L)
 Elgie, Hon. R. G., Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (York East PC)
 Johnston, R. F. (Scarborough West NDP)
 Kerrio, V. G. (Niagara Falls L)
 Kolyn, A. (Lakeshore PC)
 Laughren, F. (Nickel Belt NDP)
 MacQuarrie, R. W. (Carleton East PC)
 Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
 McCaffrey, Hon. R. B., Minister of Citizenship and Culture (Armourdale PC)
 McClellan, R. A. (Bellwoods NDP)
 Miller, Hon. F. S., Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics (Muskoka PC)
 Mitchell, R. C. (Carleton PC)
 Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
 O'Neil, H. P. (Quinte L)
 Peterson, D. R. (London Centre L)
 Pollock, J. (Hastings-Peterborough PC)
 Rae, R. K. (York South NDP)
 Ramsay, Hon. R. H., Minister of Labour (Sault Ste. Marie PC)
 Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L-Lab.)
 Renwick, J. A. (Riverdale NDP)
 Riddell, J. K. (Huron-Middlesex L)
 Rotenberg, D. (Wilson Heights PC)
 Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
 Swart, M. L. (Welland-Thorold NDP)
 Sweeney, J. (Kitchener-Wilmot L)
 Taylor, Hon. G. W., Solicitor General (Simcoe Centre PC)
 Turner, Hon. J. M., Speaker (Peterborough PC)
 Van Horne, R. G. (London North L)
 Walker, Hon. G. W., Minister of Industry and Trade (London South PC)
 Wells, Hon. T. L., Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Scarborough North PC)
 Wiseman, Hon. D. J., Minister of Government Services (Lanark PC)



Hansard

Official Report of Debates

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Third Session, 32nd Parliament

Tuesday, May 3, 1983

Afternoon Sitting

Speaker: Honourable John M. Turner

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

Contents of the proceedings reported in this issue of Hansard appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of the speakers taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is \$15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, Information Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 965-2238.



LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Tuesday, May 3, 1983

The House met at 2 p.m.
Prayers.

ARTICLE IN NEWSPAPER

Mr. Haggerty: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege: Twice in a column written by Claire Hoy in the Toronto Sun a statement in the chamber has been attributed to my honourable colleague the member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Kerrio).

I would like the record to show that I in fact made that remark. I regret any embarrassment the comments may have caused this Legislature.

ORAL QUESTIONS

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, I note again today that the Premier (Mr. Davis) is not here, and again it was on his schedule that he would be attending today. Again I have a question for him. You may want to address your mind, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that we are becoming increasingly a province without a Premier, and even though he may have his mind elsewhere—

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

Mr. Peterson: —there are certain obligations and duties here in this House.

That being said, you will note the attendance of the cabinet ministers and the Premier over the last little while. It is not something that has done very much to elevate the parliamentary process in anyone's mind.

Mr. Speaker, I am casting my eyes across the House looking for the senior minister, and it is difficult to find one. That being said, I will go to the Deputy Premier (Mr. Welch), who is in his place today. It must inspire some fear in your heart that that man could actually be the Premier for a while in this province, Mr. Speaker.

DAMAGE BY TORNADOES

Mr. Peterson: Let me ask him a question. Would the Deputy Premier care to bring this House up to date on the extensive damage suffered in many communities in southwestern Ontario as a result of tornadoes? I would ask the minister for the government's assessment of the situation in those communities, particularly in the Sarnia area in the vicinity of Plympton

township. Will he be recommending to cabinet that these areas be declared disaster areas eligible for special assistance?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that field staff of the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing made a preliminary trip of investigation in the areas hardest hit by the storm yesterday afternoon. In fact, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Mr. Bennett) and the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Mr. Henderson) are in the Sarnia area this afternoon to learn at first hand the details of the damage.

It is also my understanding that an office has been set up in the area by employees of the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing so that property owners can come in and give details of the extent of the damage they have experienced. I think it is early yet to share with the House any estimate of that damage. No doubt the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing will be in a much better position to share that information with members following his investigation this afternoon.

Mr. Peterson: The minister will be aware that we have had discussions in this House before about the type of special relief that should be going to hard-hit areas at the time of a natural disaster. Does he not feel it is time the government approached these matters, not on an ad hoc basis, but in terms of some permanent policy?

For example, my colleague the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk (Mr. Nixon) has suggested at various times in this House that we should have an emergency relief fund, perhaps even established with lottery funds, to provide loan and grant assistance to individuals and communities that are subject to extraordinary expenditures due to a natural disaster.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I can appreciate the position being taken by the leader of the official opposition. However, the record of this government in responding to need as it has arisen speaks for itself. It is a record I hope all members of the House want to share in.

The particular point is whether we have a policy to which we subject individual situations

or whether we respond to individual situations once satisfied as to the extent of the damage. I am quite satisfied, in fact quite impressed, that officials of the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing were on the scene yesterday, that a field office has been established today and that people are being urged to come in today to discuss with government officials their losses and the extent of the damage.

The minister himself is there today with the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development, indicating a personal interest and concern. I feel quite satisfied that once we have a complete understanding of the extent of the damage, this government, as usual, will respond in a very humane and responsible way.

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister would not agree that one of the advantages of having an established program is that the government, as soon as the news of a disaster reaches it, as happened yesterday, would be able to respond in an official way rather than simply responding in an ad hoc way as the crisis arises. We simply ask the Deputy Premier to have another look at this problem. It may give the citizens of this province a greater assurance that not only will things appear to be done, but they will be done in reality, and all the capacities of government will be put into motion right away.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I think the final assessment of a successful response to this is, in fact, responding to it. No one is going to fault us, and I hope the honourable leader will commend the ministry for moving in as quickly as it has. Let the member look at the pattern. Perhaps he has not been in the House long enough to assess the fact and study the history of this approach. We have responded in a fairly clear way, once the extent of the damage was known.

I am quite satisfied, with the minister there today, that there is no one in that part of the province who has suffered any loss who feels this government is not sensitive to and very sympathetic about the damage he or she has suffered and that it does not want to move in a responsible way according to established principles in that regard.

POLLUTION CONTROL

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of the Environment relating to the matter of Swaru, the solid waste reduction unit, and the emissions of dioxin and furan from that plant. I am aware the minister has cut

production some 20 per cent and changes in the boiler have been made so that emissions have been somewhat reduced.

That being said, does he not feel it would be an appropriate and reasonable response by his ministry, given the very wide degree of concern felt in that area by the people who may be affected by that plant, to engage in testing of the individuals who live nearby that plant and are thereby potentially affected by these emissions?
2:10 p.m.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, I can assure the honourable member that I would not hesitate to do what would be appropriate in any such situation.

I have had rather extensive discussions with medical people on whether they feel it would be either necessary or advisable at this time. To date, the advice has been no, that it would not be productive—in part, I suppose, because the complex combination of things that might be present there would lead to no conclusion whatsoever with respect to the particular point the member is raising. Furthermore, in their opinion, there is no indication that there is any need for such a study.

Mr. Peterson: The minister will be aware that view is not shared by a variety of other people, particularly if one is living adjacent to that plant and given the amount of concern that has been exhibited locally. The minister, I know, is aware of all that. He is also aware of the Tricil report, which said afterburners could have some effect on the emissions from that plant.

Does he not feel, as Minister of the Environment, that he has an obligation to proceed with those plans? Does he not feel, as minister and as the guardian for those people, that he has an obligation to make sure every possible avenue is pursued to monitor and protect the health of people in that area?

Hon. Mr. Norton: With respect to the matter of the operation of the plant that the member referred to, I can assure him the work that is under way is very extensive. In fact, I believe contracts now have been signed—I have not personally been the signatory to the contracts—to the tune of some \$300,000 for work to be done on the plant in terms of addressing ways in which its efficiency can be improved.

Studies are under way relating to the testing of the design of the plant, the operations and present practices there, to determine what improvements can be made.

In the interim, as the member has already

indicated, the operation of the plant has been cut back by 20 per cent, and the advice I have received is that this brings the emissions within the guideline which, as I indicated in the House at the time of my original announcement of the findings, is a very conservative guideline in terms of the precautions that are implicit in its development.

Mr. Charlton: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Swaru incinerator has been operating for more than a decade and the readings his ministry got last summer were after a number of technical changes in the operation of that facility over the course of the decade, and in view of the fact that nobody knows what the emissions were in the past but it is quite likely they were much worse, on what basis is the minister saying there is no indication of a need to go in and test people in the community? Why will he not go in and find out what possible damage may have been done?

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated in response to the initial question from the Leader of the Opposition—in fact, I think I have addressed the honourable member's question; he is repeating the first question of the Leader of the Opposition.

Interjection.

Hon. Mr. Norton: If I am not mistaken, the member for Hamilton Centre (Ms. Copps) asked essentially the same question back at the time of the announcement. I am sorry, I forgot about the hot competition between the two members.

Interjection.

Hon. Mr. Norton: He is claiming credit. I am not sure. One or the other of the members asked the question.

Mr. Bradley: Anyway, answer the question.

Hon. Mr. Norton: I am about to do that if the member for St. Catharines will just give me an opportunity.

I think what the honourable member is asking for is an epidemiological study, and if he were to discuss the advisability of an epidemiological study with experts in that field, with medical people, I think he would probably get the same advice as I have. If he can get contrary advice, then fine, he can let me know about it.

But the purpose of epidemiology is not to go and look for symptoms, and there is no indication, I am told, of any particular problem relating to health effects in that community. If there were, then it would be an appropriate time to do an epidemiological study to determine what the

causes of any symptoms might be. But the member has not presented to me or to the medical people, nor have they seen, any evidence of any aberrational symptoms.

Mr. Peterson: Surely the minister's responsibility is to move ahead of time, not after the fact. His entire approach seems to be that we will wait until someone gets very ill or until there is evidence, and then we will move on the situation.

The minister is aware, I am sure, that even with the cutback at Swaru, according to Dr. Frank Karasek, it is pumping 100 times the amount of dioxin that some of the more modern plants tested in France, for example, are pumping out; and he is aware that it is at a potentially dangerous level or else he would not be taking the action he is engaging in at the present time.

Surely, given the play of dioxin emissions in this province in a variety of—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I will ask all honourable members to curtail their private conversations in the House please, and I would ask the Leader of the Opposition to place his question.

Mr. Peterson: It is obvious that bunch needs a little leadership, Mr. Speaker. The cat is away and the mice will play.

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

Mr. Peterson: I am back to the Minister of the Environment on this matter, with whose approach I fundamentally disagree. He is waiting for evidence of major health problems before he is prepared to move, and by that time it is going to be too late.

Given the evidence we have now in a variety of areas in this province—Niagara, the Welland Canal, the Detroit River, the St. Clair River, Swaru and a variety of others—of this deadly chemical sneaking into the atmosphere, the water and a variety of other places, surely the minister's responsibility is to develop the medical process to understand the potential effects of this chemical and not to wait 20 years, when it will be too late. Would the minister not think this is part of his responsibility?

Mr. McClellan: Yes or no.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Well, as with most things, it is not quite that simple. I do want to give the honourable member the fullest possible answer, and I do hope the Speaker will allow me that opportunity.

Mr. Speaker: Briefly.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Norton: It is really not for me to try to pretend that I am a medical expert. If the member wishes to pretend that he is, that is fine. I happen also to have a responsibility to discharge on behalf of the public in this province that requires me to be responsible, thoughtful and careful when I am dealing with matters that may relate to issues involving human health, and that is the way I will continue to function. I will seek the very best medical advice that is available to me and I will take it into consideration in making the decisions I am responsible for making.

If the member has any evidence to the contrary, other than wishing, perhaps, to make this into an issue on which medical people would disagree with him, then I would ask him to be a little more thoughtful himself in his responses to this particular problem. It is not being treated lightly and it will not be treated lightly, but I will insist on proceeding responsibly in dealing with these serious issues that face us in our society.

2:20 p.m.

Furthermore, the impression the Leader of the Opposition and his caucus are trying to create that there is "an epidemic of dioxin" in Ontario—I think that is the phrase his critic has used, or something of that nature—is fallacious. Really what we are seeing is the result of major advances in technology that have been implemented in this province, which are allowing us to detect very low levels of dioxin in certain areas where they have probably existed for a long time from natural sources such as combustion—natural to the extent they have been with us for a long time.

If the member has a fire in his fireplace, he is probably contributing dioxin to the—

Mr. Speaker: Order. Thank you. New question, the member for York South.

SENIOR CITIZENS SERVICES

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Community and Social Services. I met today with a Mrs. Annie Hayes, a remarkable 89-year-old woman who is living at 51 Greenlaw Avenue in west Toronto. Mrs. Hayes told me she would be forced to leave her home in which she has lived since 1944 and move into an institution unless she continues to be provided services by the West Metro Senior Citizens Services centre.

What response is the Ministry of Community and Social Services going to make to the request

from the West Metro Senior Citizens Services centre for the \$17,000 that will enable it to stay alive this year? What response will come from the ministry so Mrs. Hayes will be able to stay in her home?

Hon. Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, I am very surprised the leader of the New Democratic Party would ask a question like that. He knows we are going to meet it. Everybody knows that. I said that last week. Where was the member?

Mr. Rae: With great respect to the minister, he has not answered the question. May I say to the minister before he gets up on his feet in hysterical rage that, if he has certain information with respect to the West Metro Senior Citizens Services, this information is not being shared with that organization. I met with them at lunchtime and they are not aware of any plans by the ministry to provide them with funding.

Instead of forcing these groups across Metro and indeed across the province to rely continually on emergency funding and to face continually the prospect of having to close, what measures is the minister going to take to provide permanent funding, as called for in the Neighbourhoods Under Stress report last week, to make sure these organizations are able to survive on a permanent, stable basis, so the senior citizens and disabled people they care for will be able to stay in their homes and not be forced into institutions? That is the impact the uncertainty is having for those people.

Hon. Mr. Drea: First of all, I answered his first question. It is not my fault the leader of the third party cannot read a newspaper, is monumentally misinformed, appears disoriented here today and is asking me the wrong question.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Now to the question, please.

Hon. Mr. Drea: One of the honourable leader's problems at the moment is he is running as a front for an alderman who gave an interview last week on the west Toronto seniors matter and said that because he had not heard, therefore—

Mr. Rae: They have not heard either.

Mr. McClellan: Nobody has heard.

Mr. Rae: Nobody has heard.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Drea: Just a moment; if the leader will let me answer, they have.

Interjection.

Hon. Mr. Drea: No, there is not. I answered the first question. I would appreciate it if—

Mr. Swart: Talk about hallucination.

Mr. McClellan: Not everybody hears voices, Frank. You will have to speak up.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Drea: Fine, they do not want an answer.

Mr. Speaker: I think the minister answered the question.

Ms. Cops: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the report was also monumentally misinformed in what it pointed out about funding in Metropolitan Toronto ridings—Ontario funding, excluding projects of a provincial nature. I know the minister had a person from Community and Social Services at the meeting which launched the report. The report pointed out the difficulties faced by organizations like this compared with one that has Wintario funding, where \$3 goes to every government riding for \$1 spent in every opposition riding in Metropolitan Toronto, excluding projects of a provincial nature. I wonder if the minister might want to comment on that.

Mr. Speaker: I do not think that is supplementary.

Hon. Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, I am a nice guy. I will answer it. I happen to believe there is a great deal of difficulty in trying to have necessary social services, such as the ones described here today, funded by lotteries. Any jurisdiction that has gone into the funding of necessary, ongoing social services by lotteries has got itself into very serious and very substantial trouble. I would have thought a supposedly in-depth study of many of the real or emerging social planning needs in Metropolitan Toronto would have been a little more creative than to ask for a pool of lottery money.

To return to the question of permanent funding, that is really something very archaic in social work. The whole thrust today is that there is core funding, then funding on a project-by-project basis. This allows the social organization, whether it is just emerging or whether it is long established, to be able to meet needs; and when those needs are met—indeed, in social work one of the central concepts is that one must be always trying to work oneself out of a job by meeting needs—it is not necessarily the end of the organization, because the organization goes ahead and pioneers on other needs.

In short, this is virtually the only way, using

the fee-for-service basis or some of the imaginative techniques that have come about in the past decade, where new groups that want to tackle new problems are even able to get into the field.

In terms of the Metro situation, my staff has been meeting with the staff of Metro social services for some time, particularly dealing with agencies that provide services to the elderly.

Mr. McClellan: You have been meeting for five or six years.

Hon. Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, with all respect, my remarks relate to an earlier supplementary which I did not have a chance to answer.

Mr. Speaker: You can answer that in due time.

Mr. Rae: I just say to the minister that the executive director of the West Metro Senior Citizens Services centre knows nothing of any plans by the ministry to provide additional funding.

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

Mr. Rae: Since I know the minister is eager to answer, does he not think a funding formula that requires of groups, such as the West Metro Senior Citizens Services centre, that they raise 30 per cent of their funding from their own fund-raising activities is totally unrealistic in view of the kind of groups they are serving and the kind of groups they are drawing their funding from?

Does the minister not think it is time to develop a formula that will provide these groups with permanent, stable funding, instead of asking them to live hand to mouth, year by year, and exist on an emergency basis? That is the real issue in this case.

Hon. Mr. Drea: If that is the real issue, then I have already met it. That is precisely why two things are occurring. My staff has met with that organization. That organization, after meeting with my people, for some peculiar reason and probably with the assistance of the member's friend, the alderman, held a press conference last Friday stating it was going to go out of business at the end of June, when indeed it knew this ministry was most sympathetic to its particular problem.

If I had not been interrupted a moment ago, I could have saved the member asking this question. I have recognized for some months the particular problem faced by agencies dealing with services to the elderly, when they are forced to raise that 30 per cent from the private sector or from other than the Metro government and ourselves. I recognize that, and I do

not know where the member has been in this House because I have said so.

Mr. R. F. Johnston: They have had to go to you every year for the past three years.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Drea: That is the very reason the social services staff of Metropolitan Toronto and my own staff have been looking, not just at the particular agency the leader of the third party discovered today but also at the one that was covered at some length in the Toronto Star last week by Miss Pigg. If he reads that story, he will see it was stated at the bottom that they never had to ask for money before, that they are the model.

The member need not wave his back hand at me. He walked into a trap today and he is going to get slapped around. He might as well sit there and like it. If he cannot keep his research straight that is not my problem.

2:30 p.m.

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, it is a incredible performance by the minister who has not even had the courtesy to tell his plans to the organization he claims he is ready to fund. What kind of a fraud is that?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Drea: I want that word "fraud" withdrawn.

Mr. Rae: I will not withdraw it, because it is a fraud. It is a fraud.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The good intentions of a week ago seem to have flown out the window. We are almost at the halfway period in question period. I ask the member for York South to withdraw that unfortunate reference, please.

Mr. Rae: I will not withdraw that remark, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Rae: I said the program that the minister claimed to be putting forward was a fraud, and I stand by those remarks. If the individuals who are running that service are not even aware of funding plans by that minister, and he gets up in this House and claims it is being done, I say that is a fraud.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I draw the member's attention to standing order 19(d)(11) and ask him to reconsider the use of that word.

An hon. member: Throw him out.

An hon. member: That is what he wants.

Mr. Speaker: All right. In the member's failure to withdraw—

Hon. Mr. Bernier: He needs help. Where's Elie?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Rae: I ask you, sir, to consider very carefully the words I used—

Mr. Speaker: No, no. Order.

Mr. Rae: I am making a request of you, Mr. Speaker, and I ask you to hear me out.

The minister has called my integrity into question in his answer to me. He called into question the information that I have. I want the minister to know, and I want you to know, sir, that not only did I meet this morning with Mrs. Hayes but I also met with Beth Hoaster-Walsh, who is the executive director of the agency in question.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The member for York South will please resume his seat.

I must point out, and I am sure all honourable members are well aware, that it is not just the specific language which is used but it is also the manner in which it is used.

Mr. Mackenzie: Doesn't it work both ways?

Mr. Rae: If I may say to you, sir, I did not at any time impute any motive to the minister. I did not at any time impute any motive with respect to his integrity. The only thing I said was with respect to a program that has not been communicated to the individuals involved. I think I am entitled in parliamentary language to describe that as a fraud. I will not withdraw that remark with respect to the program.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. As I said before, it was not the specific language, it was the temper in which it was used.

Mr. Laughren: Boy oh boy. Majority government.

Mr. Speaker: Order. There is plenty of precedence for that in May and in Beauchesne.

Mr. Bradley: Throw him out.

Mr. Laughren: That's the way to run it.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I ask the member for York South to give this serious consideration—

Mr. Conway: Mr. Speaker, on Friday, when I was here listening to the vigorous intervention of the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry) in response to a number of questions, I had occasion to review Beauchesne, and you are correct, sir, in so far as Beauchesne is concerned. It has been ruled in Ottawa on a couple of occasions that "fraud" is unparliamentary. I refer to page 107 of Beauchesne.

In my humble estimation, what the leader of

the third party has said may be, according to Beauschesne, unparliamentary, but I do not think it is any more unparliamentary than what the minister said in some agitation when he referred to the leader of the third party as—I think I heard him correctly—“running a front for some alderman.” That, in my view, is an imputation of motive. I think, if we want the leader of the third party to withdraw the reference to “fraud,” we should also invite the minister to withdraw that reference, which is just as unparliamentary.

Mr. Speaker: Quite obviously, both honourable members have taken a very hard view of this. In the spirit of compromise, if both honourable members did get carried away, and to maintain the decorum and dignity of this House having regard to the language and the temper in which it was used, if indeed the minister did make that reference, I ask him to withdraw that reference.

Hon. Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, I did make the reference, and I will withdraw it. Also—

Mr. Speaker: That is all we need, thank you. Having done that, which I presume was part of the cause for the response from the member for York South, I ask him to reconsider.

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, given that the word I used has been deemed by the parliamentary authorities to be unparliamentary, I certainly withdraw it. I would still like an answer to my question from the minister.

Mr. Speaker: Having said that, we will move right along with a new question.

Hon. Mr. Drea: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker: It was also mentioned by the leader of the third party during some of his latter remarks, in attempting to deal with the point of order, that in his view I had made reference to his integrity. If that is his view, then whatever he considers were reflections upon his integrity—not his ability, but his integrity—I will withdraw them as well.

Mr. Wrye: Have you got another one to withdraw?

Mr. Rae: I do not know what else I can withdraw. I do not have any more bones to throw to the minister.

An hon. member: He still has not answered your question.

Mr. Rae: I think the answer to the question will have to await another day.

SPARTON OF CANADA LTD.

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a

question of the Minister of Industry and Trade. On February 15, the minister made a statement to this House with respect to Sparton of Canada Ltd. The minister advised the House that his information at that time was that 50 per cent of the people who were on indefinite layoff, or 34 people, would be recalled at the London plant.

Is the minister aware that not only have these 34 people not been recalled as of this date, which is some two weeks after the mid-April date on which he advised us they would be recalled, but also the seven people who were temporarily recalled at the time he made his statement have since been laid off as well? What is the minister prepared to do to restore employment at the Sparton plant in London?

2:40 p.m.

Hon. Mr. Walker: Mr. Speaker, to answer the question initially asked, the information I provided to the House at the time was simply the information provided as a result of an inquiry made by us to the company. That information was transmitted to the House. It was presumably right at the time and I presume there has been no difference since that time.

It may be that business conditions have altered, alternative steps have been taken in the industry and perhaps there have been other people laid off. I am not reflecting on that particular situation. I could relate to two or three other layoffs the honourable member might like to raise questions about and two or three other places where people have been recalled. So there are plenty of incidents of both.

Mr. Rae: At that same time, the minister also made a statement that the plant at Campbellford would be making what he called a new product. Information in January from both the Liberal Minister of State (Trade) and the Liberal Minister of Supply and Services in Ottawa indicates that what the Campbellford plant will be making is the same sonobuoy system that was previously made in London prior to the strike which led the company to ship much of its product to the United States.

Can the minister confirm that information for the House? Would he therefore not like to reconsider his basic judgement that the Campbellford plant is doing new work that was not being done prior to this time in London, when the evidence suggests overwhelmingly that what is planned at Campbellford is exactly the same production that was previously done in

London? That again leads to the conclusion that what we have here is a company that is moving its operation to a nonunion plant from a plant where collective bargaining and a collective agreement have been in place.

Hon. Mr. Walker: I stand by exactly what I said in the House when I gave the information. I related at the time that I was merely providing the information supplied to me by officials of Sparton of Canada. If that information is incorrect then they are the ones who have made the incorrect observation. I happen to think it was probably accurate. I am prepared to write and find out whether it is or not, and I am prepared to report the details to the member.

Mr. Sweeney: Mr. Speaker, the minister will be well aware of the rather strong differences that were expressed when that particular operation took place. It may very well be that the information given to the minister by the company was accurate at the time.

I would like to know what mechanism is in place within the ministry to follow up and keep a continuing check on situations similar to this one, so that what the minister was told five or six months ago continues to be correct and he is not just being sold a bill of goods after which they walk away and do something quite different. How does the minister know what the continuing effect is?

Hon. Mr. Walker: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member is suggesting that we have some kind of cross-examination process whereby we go in and examine every two months the verification of any information provided by the company, we do not have that. We would have to rely on any complaint that might be raised by other people in this House or by people who work within the plant. Presumably that is the way in which this matter has come forward.

I am prepared to check into the matter further and find out if the information I had then is accurate today.

Mr. Rae: What has happened here is that the minister has simply transmitted to the House, holus-bolus, basically self-serving information from the company involved and he has ignored the information that has been forthcoming from the trade union and former executives of the company.

In the light of that fact, why does the minister not make a genuine inquiry, rather than simply going to the company and then transmitting that information to the House, holding it out to be absolutely correct when the information we are

getting now is that the information coming from the company has been less than the whole truth?

Hon. Mr. Walker: The leader of the third party may be indicating that the officials of Sparton are lying, and if that is the case, we will obtain more information. I am not prepared to say they are lying. The information I had, I took to be true on face value. I cannot imagine that people would be sending me lies, but they may be and I will check it out. However, if they are telling the truth, perhaps the member who has raised this question may be prepared to make an apology for having said that of the people at Sparton in London.

HYDRO RATES

Mr. Kerrio: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier-in-waiting, the Minister of Energy, regarding Ontario Hydro's proposal to increase electrical rates by some 9.7 per cent this year and by some 33 per cent over the next three years.

The report by the Ontario Energy Board stated two years ago: "It is recommended that an examination of capital expenditure and cost controls be undertaken by the board in the near future." Again last year the board stated: "However, the board must admit that system costs are heavily impacted by the capital program and that little can be done by the board in the way of economy measures to reduce costs without effective participation in the determination of the system expansion program."

In view of this, will the minister instruct Ontario Hydro and the Ontario Energy Board, as a first priority, to hold hearings to examine Ontario Hydro's system expansion program and its effects on driving up electrical costs?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member knows—in fact, I think the advertisements are in the papers today; they were in yesterday—the Ontario Energy Board now has established some dates for its public hearings to review the proposal for the 1984 bulk rate. Therefore, the only matter before the Ontario Energy Board now will be the bulk rate for 1984.

I think it is important that we get this in proper perspective, because the speculation with respect to what rates may be in other years is not unlike what happened a year ago when we had all sorts of speculation on that subject, only to find that the rate request for 1984 was much less than that people were talking about a year ago.

As we know, the Ontario Energy Board will start its hearings the end of May, I believe.

There will be ample opportunity for the public generally to make their representations with respect to the proposal made by Hydro for their rates for 1984.

Mr. Kerrio: The minister must be aware that they were not willing to allow the energy board to delve into these programs.

In view of Ontario Hydro's \$3-million "Go Electric" media campaign designed to bring back the "Live Better Electrically" era and to increase consumption by 3.7 per cent this year and four per cent next year—although the actual increase last year dropped to 0.8 per cent—I wonder whether, in Ontario Hydro's desperation to find markets for its large and growing surplus of electricity, the minister is going to continue to allow this kind of advertising program.

In view of Ontario Hydro's capital expansion decisions, which now are made in private, as the minister knows, will he charge the Ontario Energy Board, or probably a select committee of this Legislature, to review the financial perils of Hydro's present course? Does he not think it is time we reconstituted the select committee, which was the only time we ever saw into the workings of Ontario Hydro?

Hon. Mr. Welch: I think the member would be reasonable and fair enough to agree that at this moment in the province, when we look with some cautious optimism in so far as economic recovery is concerned, we should be very pleased that we have the electricity resource that we have in this province on which to build. I think it is to the credit of those who have been charged with the responsibility over the years, in so far as the public utility is concerned, that we are in such a strong energy position with respect to our electrical capacity.

If the member reads his own Niagara Falls Evening Review, he will notice the economic impact the Darlington operation is having right in his home city of Niagara Falls; the jobs that are there because of the contracts awarded to Provincial Engineering. That newspaper carried a picture of equipment leaving that great city, part of that great riding, and going to that particular project.

That is jobs, and that is the language the people want to hear. The public utility has kept pace with this and in fact is building its capacity so there will be a great degree of predictability that as Ontario continues in its economic recovery, we will have this great energy strength in our electrical system. I think Hydro is being very responsible, in so far as its program is

concerned, in making sure the electrical option is well and clearly known to the people of this province.

Mr. Foulds: Mr. Speaker, is it not then at this time that the minister himself should refer Hydro's capital expenditure program to the Ontario Energy Board, as was done in 1976, so we can have a full understanding of the cost structure that goes into the rates and stop this ad hoc, year-by-year jacking up of the rates when everyone from the public who wishes to participate is working in the fog because not all the facts come to light at the Ontario Energy Board hearings?

2:50 p.m.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I hardly need remind my learned friend of the history of this public utility in this province, charged as it is with the mandate under the Power Corporation Act of providing electricity to its customers in this province at the lowest cost consistent with good business practice.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Power at cost: that has been the watchword, and I think we should be giving this utility far more credit for what it has done. Just look at its history of rates, all up for public review starting at the end of May.

LAYOFFS AT ALLEN INDUSTRIES CANADA

Mr. Mackenzie: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Industry and Trade. With the announcement late last week of the sixth plant in Hamilton to be permanently shut down and the loss of 200 employees at Allen Industries Canada, I wonder whether the minister was aware of the decision to close permanently the Allen Industries fibre production plant in Stoney Creek, which was leaked last Thursday? If so, why did he not inform some of the local officials, who were taken by surprise by this announcement?

Hon. Mr. Walker: Mr. Speaker, maybe I am missing something here, but it seems to me the plant closed last December with the loss of the employees and did not close just last week. What the honourable member heard last week, which was apparently leaked out—I was not aware at the time that it was coming forward—was the decision that the company had rejected the request that it reconsider its position and reopen the fibre products plant.

They have continued, of course, with the trim

plant, but I wonder whether perhaps the member has made a mistake and missed reading the newspaper last December, when in fact this plant closed. He must have overlooked it, because my understanding is that that is when it occurred. The announcement of it was back in September 1982; the closure was December 31, 1982. Has he missed these 200 employees in that period of time, or what has been the problem? I wonder if he could answer that.

Mr. Mackenzie: The answer to that is very simple. The minister well knows we had a layoff and a temporary shutdown last September, but we now have a permanent plant closure.

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

Mr. Mackenzie: Can the minister tell us—

Mr. Speaker: That is better.

Hon. Mr. Welch: That was December 31.

Mr. Mackenzie: The minister should talk to some of the local officials.

In as much as the production of this plant that remains, plus the replacement production for the auto industry, is now being moved by Dayco, the Daytona, Florida, head office of this company, to a plant in Illinois, can the minister tell us what he is doing to see that the production, which might result in the protection of the jobs of the workers, stays here in Canada and does not add to our deficit?

If he is not prepared to do something about the production and the decision of a branch plant once again to move the operation out of Canada, what is he going to do for the workers at Allen Industries?

Hon. Mr. Walker: It is actually being moved to Richmond, Virginia, not to Illinois. But there is a rationalization going on. There is a bit of sketchy information.

I talked to our people this morning, and the information from the Hamilton office is that they still feel optimistic that something can be done relative to an application under the industry and labour adjustment program. There have been considerable discussions now, and even though the announcement last Friday appears to close the door, there is still some feeling on the part of our Hamilton office that something can be done relative to the ILAP application, and of course our people are continuing to try to promote that and to continue the operation.

While there are 200 employees who regrettably are lost in this situation if the closure from December continues—and obviously it is continuing, by the sound of the announcement from last weekend—nevertheless, the trim plant is

still going forward with the employees it has; I think it is about 140 employees. So there is some continuance of the operation there.

We hope that somehow ILAP can be involved in the process to encourage this plant to continue its operations here. That would be our goal. Our people still think with some optimism that it can be done. However, I think it was certainly disquieting to have the information of the review that came forward as of last weekend.

Ms. Coppins: Mr. Speaker, I am shocked that the minister should be speaking on behalf of the company and saying rationalization has caused the company to move to the United States. Is he not the Minister of Industry and Trade for Ontario? Why is it every time we hear of a plant closing in this province the minister stands in the House and justifies it on the basis of rationalization when these are jobs going outside the province and the country?

Hon. Mr. Walker: Mr. Speaker, that is a totally ludicrous question posed by the honourable member and she should know better. If she would pay attention, she would know better than to ask that kind of question. I was not defending the company position. The question was asked of me. The information I had was that it was a rationalizing process. I was imparting the best information I have. What would the member rather have me do? Would she have me impart some other information to her? I suppose she would.

GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING

Mr. Bradley: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Treasurer. He will recall that my leader asked a question about the expenditure on Suncor earlier this week. I am asking the minister a question about his advertising budget. For the second year in a row, the Treasurer has not cut his advertising budget. The figures show that in the past year he spent another \$40 million on advertising and related activities in a year of restraint.

Will he give an undertaking to the House, one he would not give me last year, that he will cut the budget for advertising by two thirds or advocate that within the cabinet in order that he can meet his obligations, for instance, in the fields of the implementation of Bill 82, assisting municipalities with welfare costs, properly funding the health care system, assisting farmers or providing relief to taxpayers in this province?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, normally the division of gross allocations to ministries is done

internally, not by the Treasury. I set an overall target for the policy fields, and they in turn allocate them to ministers, who break them up into the component parts of their budgets. Each year, for as long as I have been here, Management Board and Treasury have been charged with the responsibility of reallocating as pressures build on spending, usually in health care. We do that successfully by finding offsets within government.

I suppose it is in that area that the relative need to disseminate information is weighed against the relative need for any other government spending. It easily may be the member's opinion that we spend too much letting the public know something about the availability of programs, but I suspect most members of the House will have some calls this week, either of thanks or inquiry, from the senior citizens of the province who read the ads telling them they are getting half of last year's taxes back—

Mr. Bradley: They say spend it on administration.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Just a second. Many of them still call. Had we not had the ads in the paper explaining things, I am quite sure the member knows his own personal case load would have been much higher last week. It simply said: "This is the way it is. This is how much you get. These are the rules, and you can expect it thus and when." I am sure the member also knows that many—

Mr. Bradley: Does that cost \$40 million?

Mr. Speaker: Never mind the interjections, please. Time is running out.

Hon. F. S. Miller: We send out something like \$400 million to \$500 million through these programs. The public has a right to know where to expect its money, when to expect it and how the program is designed. That is not advertising. It is too bad that, because we run a good government, every time we put any notice in the paper the members over there get all upset because they think we are beating them.

Mr. Cunningham: Mr. Speaker, surely the Treasurer is aware that in the course of one year the total advertising budget went from \$26 million to more than \$40 million. How can he seek to justify that? Could he and would he not be in a position as Treasurer to implement a restraint program with his ministries and suggest that each and every ministry cut its budget by 20 or 25 per cent? Is he not aware that General Foods spends only \$23 million nationally and General Motors spends \$24 million?

Does he not think his advertising expenditures are somewhat obscene?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I would only need to compare them to those of the federal Liberal government, which is the biggest single advertiser in Canada.

3 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The question was, "Would the Treasurer not implement a restraint program?"

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, he was able to use the word "obscene." He asked, did I not think they were obscene. Was that not a question?

Mr. Speaker: No. The first question is the one we have to answer.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I thought I had my choice.

Mr. Speaker: No. The question was, "Would the Treasurer not implement a program of restraint?"

Hon. F. S. Miller: The spending in 1981 was \$40 million. The spending in 1981-82 was \$40 million.

Mr. Foulds: Mr. Speaker, does the Treasurer not feel just a little bit embarrassed? Does he not feel—

Mr. Wrye: No. New question.

Mr. Foulds: Then he knows no shame at all, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

Mr. Foulds: Does the Treasurer not recognize, if he knows no embarrassment, that there is a very real difference between self-serving advocacy advertising, which this government and the federal Liberal government have wholly and totally endorsed, and legitimate advertising which the public of Ontario needs about its government programs? Will he not at least cut back totally on his advocacy advertising?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, there were three questions. I do not feel the least little bit embarrassed to be a part of this great team over here under the leadership of the Premier (Mr. Davis).

PROCLAMATION OF ACT

Mr. Charlton: I have a question for the Minister of the Environment, Mr. Speaker. It has been three and a half years since the spills bill was passed and the major reason for the holdup in terms of proclamation has been the regulations.

Last fall, the draft regulations were widely circulated. His ministry has been receiving comments from industry and from environment

groups. Can he give us some kind of an indication of his intentions in terms of the proclamation of that piece of legislation?

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, I would hope to do it as expeditiously as possible. There is one factor which is delaying it somewhat at the moment.

As the honourable member knows, we have received responses from quite a wide variety of people. One of the most prevalent concerns is related to the availability of insurance to provide adequate protection for haulers. We have retained an expert consultant in the insurance industry who is examining that for us. As soon as that information is available, I will make it available to the people who have responded to the material that was circulated. I would hope we could resolve the outstanding concerns and proceed with it quickly this spring.

ARTICLE IN NEWSPAPER

Hon. Mr. Gregory: Mr. Speaker, on a point of personal privilege: A little earlier, the member for Erie (Mr. Haggerty) rose to his feet on a point of privilege to say that he had made certain statements that caused some controversy yesterday.

I had spoken to a reporter late yesterday afternoon and gave to him what was my opinion of what actually happened. In view of the statements by the member for Erie, I would like to offer my apologies to the member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Kerrio) for any embarrassment I may have caused.

Mr. Brandt: Mr. Speaker, I too was involved in the situation that was just described by the chief government whip. In the light of the clarification made today by the member for Erie, I would like to offer my unqualified apology to the member for Niagara Falls and indicate to him that it was a clear case of mistaken identity.

Mr. Breaugh: Mr. Speaker, I too was involved in a discussion about that matter with the reporter and I too would like to offer my apologies to the honourable member.

Mr. Speaker: The co-operation is overwhelming.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, this whole series of apologies proves one thing: many of us here thought these people did not hear well and now we are convinced that they not only do not hear well, but they also do not see well.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

SMALL CLAIMS COURTS AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. McMurtry moved, seconded by Hon. Mr. Norton, first reading of Bill 28, An Act to amend the Small Claims Courts Act.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, the amendments I am introducing today will cure a number of problems in small claims court practice which have come to light in recent months.

The bill will provide for interest to run on small claims court judgements in the same manner and at the same rate as interest currently runs on judgements of the Supreme Court and county and district courts.

The bill will also clarify the right of a small claims court agent to file an execution against land in the sheriff's office as a step in the enforcement of the judgement.

The bill also makes provision for claims to be served, where necessary, by a combination of service on an adult member of the defendant's household together with mail service. This new method of service has been tested in the provincial court, civil division, in Metropolitan Toronto and has proved to be effective and time saving.

The bill also makes several other minor amendments.

ESTATES ADMINISTRATION AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. McMurtry moved, seconded by Hon. Mr. Welch, first reading of Bill 29, An Act to amend the Estates Administration Act.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to reintroduce today a bill to amend the Estates Administration Act. This is substantially the same bill that was introduced two years ago, but due to a shortage of legislative time I was unable to proceed with the legislation at that time.

As I indicated to the Legislature earlier, and I think most of the members are aware, during the past few years certain problems have been encountered in attempting to deal with the estates of persons dying in Ontario who leave beneficiaries in the Soviet Union and these concerns have been brought to the attention of my ministry.

It appears that exorbitant charges by the Soviet government or its agents and a low exchange rate for conversion of dollars into

roubles result in a beneficiary receiving less than the amount he should receive.

While it is clear that Ontario legislation cannot by any means completely rectify such problems, we should attempt to prevent, if not substantially alleviate, such abuses.

A private member's bill, Bill 8, has also been introduced recently by my colleague the Justice critic for the Liberal Party, the member for Kitchener (Mr. Breithaupt). Although Bill 8 is an attempt to alleviate these problems, its confiscatory nature makes it impossible for me to give it my support.

The Estates Administration Amendment Act 1983 contains a provision whereby a court order is required before money can be paid out of an estate in Ontario to a beneficiary in certain countries to be designated by regulation.

The provision is based on legislation in the United States, such as subsection 22(18) of the Surrogate Courts Procedure Act of New York, under which a surrogate court may withhold payment of money unless it is satisfied that the claimant will have the "benefit or use and control" of it.

Money can properly be withheld if it appears that its full value will not reach the beneficiary by reason of various fees and taxes and an unrealistic exchange rate.

A further provision in the Estates Administration Amendment Act 1983 requires a person who receives property in respect of which an order has been made as agent, solicitor or signee to file a report to the surrogate clerk for Ontario in a form and containing such information as will be prescribed by regulation. If the property is transferred directly to a foreign beneficiary, the personal representative must file such a report.

3:10 p.m.

POLISH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. Ruprecht: Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the House the very significant day of May 3 in Polish history and the subsequent celebrations that will take place today.

The Constitution of 1791 brought in many new reforms, such as the elimination of class distinctions, the protection of the individual under the law, parliamentary representation and freedom of religion. The Constitution of 1791 is regarded as one of the most progressive and advanced constitutions of the time in Europe. It is considered by Poles as marking the political and moral rebirth of the Polish nation.

Tonight the Polish flag will be raised at Toronto city hall as a symbol of the continuing struggle for the freedom and independence of Poland. I would hereby like to give notice to every member who would like to attend tonight's flag-raising ceremony to lend his or her support to the struggle for freedom and independence for Poland.

THRONE DEBATE SCHEDULE

Hon. Mr. Gregory: Before the orders of the day, Mr. Speaker, the House leaders had agreed to divide the time equally during the throne speech debate up to the time of the final speakers, which will occur on Thursday. At this point Mr. McFedries, the Assistant Clerk, tells me that the time remaining will allow everybody a total of about six hours and three minutes to six hours and five minutes.

As it works out, the Progressive Conservative Party has two hours left, the Liberal Party one hour and the New Democratic Party two hours. The whips have agreed to go by this schedule, and I ask the clerks to co-operate in that timing. Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether it would be in order to ask the Clerk or you to intercede when the time has been used.

Mr. Speaker: I think there is something wrong with the arithmetic.

Hon. Mr. Gregory: Those were the total times as supplied by the Clerk.

Mr. Speaker: Okay.

Hon. Mr. Gregory: It would be plus another 15 minutes, right?

Mr. Speaker: Right.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(continued)

Resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

Mr. Conway: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: For the record more than anything else, my colleague the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk (Mr. Nixon), who was in the midst of a rather lively and, many of us felt, quite interesting intervention yesterday, is unfortunately not able to be here with us to conclude it this afternoon. I just wanted to have the record indicate that he is with the other two House leaders, dark in the recesses of this building,

contemplating ways and means of altering the rules.

So on the member's behalf I just wanted to clear that for the record, lest anyone who reads the proceedings of this place wonder why he concluded his remarks as he did last night.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I rise to participate in the throne speech debate and I extend to you my courteous greetings on your continuing in the chair of this assembly during this session.

I intend today to limit my remarks entirely to the topic of what has become known as the Norcen affair. Mr. Speaker, I know you will recall that last Friday I tried unsuccessfully to persuade you that this was a matter of urgent public importance, so I rise now on the first occasion available to me to pursue my concerns with respect to that affair.

There are two questions in the Norcen affair. Was a false issuer bid circular issued by Norcen Energy Resources Ltd. on October 27, 1981? Did Mr. Conrad Black influence the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry) or the Ontario Securities Commission in their consideration of this question?

Conrad Black and his brother Montegu Black can be safely said to control Norcen. The report of the investigation by staff of the commission says, "Conrad Black has stated that if the criterion of control is the power to control the policies of Norcen if he wished to do so, then he does control the company." Mr. Black has brought his influence to bear in private meetings and conversations and in public comment. I am speaking of influence, not—and I repeat, not—of corruption or bribery, or money changing hands, or promises of future benefits for present favours or anything illegal.

The Norcen board on October 16, 1981, authorized the purchase by the company of up to 4.99 per cent of its issued common shares through the facilities of the Toronto and Montreal exchanges. The issuer bid circular was dated October 27, 1981, mailed to its shareholders on October 28 and 29 and filed with the commission on November 4. It was signed by Edward G. Battle, president and chief executive officer, and certified in paragraph 8, "There are no material changes or plans for material changes in the affairs of Norcen which have not been generally disclosed."

In paragraph 7, under the caption "Material Changes," the circular stated, "Norcen has no present plans or proposals for material changes in its affairs, including no plans or proposals to liquidate, sell, lease or exchange all or substantially

all of the assets of Norcen or to amalgamate Norcen with any body corporate or to make any other major changes in the business, corporate structures, management or personnel of Norcen." The circular contained no reference to Hanna Mining Co. or to the ownership by Norcen of shares of Hanna Mining Co.

On October 26, 1981, Norcen owned 203,700 shares of Hanna. On October 27, 1981, Black was informed by Jim Connacher of Gordon Securities that a block of 580,000 Hanna shares was available. On October 28, 1981, Norcen bought these shares, bringing its total ownership to 783,700 shares, or 8.8 per cent. The securities commission has mishandled its consideration of the first question by the illegality of its proceedings and no longer has any jurisdiction to determine whether misrepresentation took place.

Moreover, the conclusion reached by the commission raises serious concerns. The charge of misrepresentation under the Securities Act cannot now be laid. The act provides that every person or company who makes a statement in any issuer bid circular required to be filed or furnished under the act or the regulations that, at the time and in the light of the circumstances under which it is made, is a misrepresentation, is guilty of an offence and on conviction is liable to a fine or imprisonment or both.

"Misrepresentation" means an untrue statement of material fact or an omission to state a material fact that is required to be stated. "Material fact" means a fact that significantly affects or would be reasonably be expected to have a significant effect on the market price or value of the securities.

The first question continues to be investigated by the Metropolitan Toronto Police with the advice and assistance, and indeed under the direction, of the crown law office of the Ministry of the Attorney General to determine whether charges should be laid under the Criminal Code. The answer to the first question must, therefore, await the conclusion of that investigation, now entering its second year, and the report of the Attorney General to this assembly. The Attorney General advised me by letter dated March 17, in response to a question I asked him in the assembly on February 21, that the police investigation may be finished by mid-May, but it may well take longer.

Why did the second question ever arise? It arose because of an ill-advised meeting in mid-May 1982 of the Attorney General and his senior civil law advisers with Mr. Conrad Black and Mr. F. A. M. Huycke, QC, a partner of

Osler, Hoskin and Harcourt and a director of Norcen.

3:20 p.m.

It was ill-advised because if an audience with the Attorney General was to be given he should have been properly briefed. Had he been properly briefed and had he asked for a pre-meeting memorandum or a letter from Mr. Black or Mr. Huycke about the serious allegations which were going to be made at the meeting, the meeting would not have taken place.

The meeting disclosed a police investigation under way by the Metropolitan Toronto Police. Indeed, a search warrant had been executed shortly before the meeting at the offices of Osler, Hoskin and Harcourt.

Serious allegations were made about a lawyer in the ministry, Mr. Brian Johnston, who had been advising the Metropolitan Toronto fraud squad officers who initiated the police investigation. This reflected on the police officers conducting the investigation.

This meeting precipitated a flurry of activity within the Ministry of the Attorney General. In the event, Mr. Johnston was removed from the investigation and Mr. Harry Black, no relation, was assigned to the investigation. Mr. Roderick McLeod, then head of the crown law office and now Deputy Solicitor General, had a series of meetings with officers of the fraud squad and officers of the Ontario Securities Commission, as well as internally.

These serious allegations, which were not put in writing, were found to be groundless. This flurry of activity raised apprehension that the Metropolitan Toronto fraud squad was being told to lay off. It was as a result of this activity and these concerns that I questioned the Attorney General and his senior advisers during the consideration of his estimates before the standing committee on administration of justice on December 15, 1982.

My own information substantiated the response of Mr. Roderick McLeod at that time that no pressure was brought to bear on the Metropolitan Toronto Police to back off and, as I have said, the police investigation, of which we await the results, continues.

Mr. Huycke and Mr. Conrad Black should have been required to make their allegations formally in writing and whatever internal investigations were then required could have taken place. I accept that the Attorney General had no further meetings with Mr. Black. I await a full explanation at an appropriate time about the removal of Mr. Johnston from any role in the

investigation. While there were questions of propriety about what Mr. Black and Mr. Huycke did in seeking the meeting, they did nothing wrong.

I turn now to the securities commission and its role in this affair. I have said the commission has mishandled the affairs by the illegality of its proceedings and there now are serious questions about its conclusion.

On Friday, April 22, in the debate on interim supply, I referred to the relevant parts in sections of the Securities Act and there is no need to repeat them.

The commission is charged with the administration of the Securities Act. That act lays out a broad scheme for the regulation of the securities industry implementing the two purposes of the Kimber commission to which the minister referred on Thursday last in his statement to the House. The day-to-day administration of the act is carried out principally by the director by delegation.

There are, however, two separate and distinct functions which the commission cannot delegate, which only it can discharge and which it can discharge only in accordance with the precise prescriptions of the statute, part V, administrative proceedings, reviews and appeals, and part VI, investigations.

There is an investigation by the commission into allegations that anyone has broken the act or the Criminal Code in relation to trading in securities, and the decision whether or not "it appears to the commission that any person or company may have" done so is a judicial proceeding—quasi-judicial in the language of administrative law—not an administrative proceeding.

This distinction is the single most essential distinction known to administrative law. In the Securities Act, this assembly granted the commission wide investigative and inquisitorial powers. These are the powers set out in part VI, investigations. They are not—and I repeat, not—available to the commission in any other part of the act. These powers may be exercised only upon the basis of a sworn statement.

The commission is a creature of the statute. It is a creature of this assembly. It is accountable to this assembly. This assembly has said clearly and unequivocally to the commission: "The special circumstances of the integrity of the securities markets so far as they are within the jurisdiction of this assembly requires you to have extraordinary powers. These powers shall be exercised as the statute requires and in no

other way." We have said to the commission, "The public interest requires that you have these powers." We have said to the public that these powers can only be exercised in accordance with the code of procedure we have established.

The commission did not so act. It ignored part VI of the act which is its sole authority. It acted illegally in its investigation.

The commission has no prosecutorial discretion. If the evidence is there, the commission must so report to the minister. It is mandatory. Prosecutorial discretion, as the Attorney General well knows, having expressed it in what has now become a classic statement made in this assembly in his decision not to prosecute Francis Fox, is a discretion exercisable after there is the evidentiary basis to proceed. The commission has no such discretion.

In the case of a charge of misrepresentation, only the minister has prosecutorial discretion. The minister has prosecutorial discretion after a report is received by the minister from the commission that an offence under the act or the code may have been committed.

If the commission had followed the procedures laid out in part VI, then I would not be speaking in this assembly today about this matter. It would be doubly so if, in following those procedures, the commission had dealt with possible offences under the act and the Criminal Code.

I have respect for the statutory procedures provided and for the integrity of the commission collectively and individually. The collective and individual failure to understand the commission's mandate is not a failure of the statute, it is a failure to understand the essential elements of administrative law.

The statement by the minister last Thursday and the correspondence tabled at that time now also raises serious concerns about the conclusion of the commission. There is obviously a serious difference of opinion between the crown law office and the commission staff on the one hand and the commission on the other.

The commission has stated in its letter to the minister of April 26:

"In the commission's view, there was not a 'material change' in the affairs of Norcen or a 'material fact' in relation to securities of Norcen within the meaning of the Securities Act until the board of directors of Norcen or the senior officers, in the belief that their decision would be confirmed by the board of directors, decided to implement a specific course of action.

"Thus in the view of the commission the material change occurred only when Norcen decided on a course of action: in this case, to make a tender offer for 51 per cent of the outstanding Hanna shares, disclosure of which was made in accordance with the act."

Mr. Conrad Black, Mr. Edward G. Battle and Mr. Montegu Black are the senior officers of Norcen. Mr. Black and his brother, Montegu Black, control Norcen. By virtue of that control, the senior officers would believe that a decision they made would be confirmed by the board.

We come back to the events leading up to and surrounding October 27, 1981. Did the commission direct its attention to whether, before or about October 27, 1981, these senior officers had made a decision to implement a material change in the affairs of Norcen in relation to Hanna? What was their intention when, at the time the issuer bid circular was signed and being mailed on October 27 and 28, 1981, they increased Norcen's holdings from 203,700 to 783,700 shares of Hanna?

3:30 p.m.

What light does the report of the investigating counsel of the commission shed on this question? The report is a lengthy one and is stated to be "informal." It consists of an index, a chronology of events from January 1979 to July 1982, the report itself of some 38 pages and in the form of a memorandum from investigative counsel G. W. Curran and David Knight to John F. Leybourne, deputy director, enforcement, of the Ontario Securities Commission, and a series of exhibits.

The investigation was instigated by the complaint of Davies, Ward and Beck, Canadian counsel for the Hanna Mining Co., on April 13, 1982.

The report recommended that charges of misrepresentation and other charges under section 118 be laid under the act. It contains the following extended comment:

"Reasons for believing the Securities Act and its underlying policies have been violated: An undisclosed intent and misleading statements.

"In August 1981, when Conrad Black and Battle commenced Norcen's purchase of Hanna shares, they told a representative of Dominion Securities that among their potential long-term objectives was an exchange of their Hanna shares for Hanna's holdings of Iron Ore—that is, Iron Ore Co. of Canada Ltd.—"or Labrador"—which I think is Labrador Mining and Exploration Co. Ltd.—"or both.

"At this time, Conrad Black had already discussed with the Humphrey family, the major Hanna shareholders, the possibility of allying with them to increase the Norcen position in Hanna on a friendly basis. He had spoken of a 'reciprocal relationship' between Norcen and Hanna (Hanna then owned 20 per cent of Labrador)," a company that was also controlled by Conrad Black and his brother, Montegu.

"Slightly less than one year later, Norcen had acquired 20 per cent of Hanna and Hanna's 20 per cent interest in Labrador. In a number of public disclosures during that period, Norcen stated only that its purchases of Hanna were for investment purposes: there was no mention of becoming the major shareholder of Hanna or of relieving Hanna of Labrador.

"In interviews with us"—that is, the investigating counsel for the commission—"the principals of Norcen have, no doubt sincerely, maintained their and the company's innocence of deception. We believe that they maintain this position because they are fixated on the two principal issues of the Cleveland litigation: whether Norcen intended to acquire 51 per cent of Hanna prior to announcing its tender offer in April 1982"—the actual report has made an error in saying it was April 1981—"and whether Norcen ever wished for anything other than a friendly entry into Hanna.

"We do not believe that these are the issues under the Ontario Securities Act. For us the questions are (1) whether Norcen and its officers intended their ultimate result of significant ownership of Hanna and of Labrador long before they attained it and (2) whether they made the disclosure of such an intention required by law.

"We are of the view that a strong case can and should be made in an appropriate forum that Norcen and certain of its individual officers broke the law by making false statements about, and omitting to disclose, an intention which constituted a material fact, and decisions which constituted material changes, within the meaning of the act.

"The case to be made is this: Conrad Black, some time prior to August 1981, concluded that Hanna was an appropriate subject for planning by Norcen. The company was somewhat known through its involvement in Iron Ore. Its major shareholders were apparently discontented with its new, nonfamily management; they were acquainted with Black and seemed favourable to him. Hanna's involvement in natural resources

held potential for assisting to attain one of Norcen's admitted goals: the derivation of 25 to 33 per cent of its earnings from assets diversified in the United States by the end of this decade.

"Black undoubtedly wanted Norcen's arrival to be friendly; he told us he was well aware of the dangers of a contested fight for control of a US company. But after George Humphrey was taken on to the Hanna board, Black was told he should deal directly with Hanna management. We suspect that Black was aware how unwelcoming management would be. Immediately after his referral to the board by Humphrey, he began Norcen's Hanna purchases.

"We would argue that at this time the Black brothers and Battle intended to acquire about 20 per cent of Hanna, quite possibly in part from the Humphrey family (three Humphrey estates were then thought by Black to be selling off Hanna stock for succession duties) and hopefully with the acquiescence of management. We cannot see any value to Norcen in the original 4.9 per cent position, whereas 20 per cent ownership offered Norcen the advantages already set out, plus the benefits of Canadianizing one or two resource companies and equity accounting for the Hanna holding.

"The reference by Battle at the September 9 meeting"—I interpolate that as a meeting of the executive board of Norcen which took place in Calgary on September 9, 1981—"to an eventual possible 51 per cent position, while admittedly not a plan or intention at that point, indicates that the 4.9 per cent program was always seen in a context of acquiring a bigger stake; it was not a modest experimental investment but a step on the road to 15 or 20 per cent.

"The unexpected availability of the large block on October 27 provided an opportunity to accelerate the program. In spite of taking them public earlier than they wished (as Montegu Black said), and requiring them to exceed the authority given them by the executive committee, the Blacks and Battle quickly picked up the shares. They depicted this purchase to us as simply overshooting the 4.9 per cent mark but did not explain why, when they originally had anticipated taking several months to reach that point, they decided to jump far beyond it, at a price approximately \$3 per share overmarket.

"We can see this decision as a step towards the larger goal, a concrete act in furtherance of an existing intention—which intention ought to have been disclosed in the notice of intention," or, I interpolate, issuer bid circular, "of October

27," in a press release and a form filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission in the United States, "and in all subsequent disclosure documents.

"The hostile reaction of the Hanna board on November 4 appears to have prompted both the commissioning of preliminary research into US takeovers prepared for Norcen in that month and Conrad Black's calling Louise Humphrey to sound her out. We suggest that Norcen would still have preferred quiet growth with the assistance of the Humphreys but was considering then that a tender offer might be necessary to prompt meaningful dialogue: as eventually it was. The Norcen people maintain that they always had an uncertainty about their ends; the evidence, however, is more consistent with an uncertainty only about the particular means to their ends.

"As we have indicated above, we are of the opinion that there is evidence for a respectable case that Norcen and certain of its officers have given to the public information with respect to Norcen's proposed investment in Hanna which was untrue and which was known to be untrue by the parties involved at the time it was disseminated.

"In brief, Norcen could be said to have disclosed through its spokespersons only an intention to acquire a modest investment in Hanna when its actual intention (at least of some of its principals) was to acquire possession of at least 20 per cent and possibly as much as 51 per cent of that company, and as well to acquire a significant—if not a control—position in Labrador or Iron Ore or both."

3:40 p.m.

The questions remain—and these are my questions: Was there a decision by the senior officers of Norcen on or before October 27, 1981, to take a significant position in Hanna? Was that decision a material change which, if disclosed, could reasonably be expected to have a significant effect on the market price or value of the common shares of Norcen?

The commission did not appear to confront or answer the question of evidence credibility. It is for these reasons that I have serious concerns about the conclusion of the commission.

It remains entirely and solely the responsibility of the Attorney General to restore public confidence that there is no such thing in our society's administration of justice as "influence in high places."

I do not underestimate the difficulty of the decision which the Attorney General will be

called upon to make, whether or not to proceed with criminal charges. We are all aware, as Mr. Justice Martin said recently, of the stigma which attaches to any person charged with a criminal offence and the personal anxiety which this causes. I do not envy the Attorney General his responsibility.

Mr. Kennedy: Mr. Speaker, once again I am pleased to have an opportunity to make a few remarks in response to the throne speech.

Mr. Conway: Like Uncle Tom, do you think you will be Premier?

Mr. Kennedy: I have no plans to make any plans in that direction.

The throne speech was one that covered a wide variety of provincial issues. The underlying essence of it was the major thrusts towards recovery of the economy in putting people back to work. There are some interesting things going on out there in our economy.

I do not think there is any question that the major issue in Ontario and in Canada, and one could easily go beyond our borders as well, is economic recovery. The federal budget is a step in this recovery. I had some difficulty in leaping for joy the way certain people in the business community have, though I give credit for the incentives and encouragement that are provided to business in the short term, which I hope will turn into a stabilizing recovery that will continue in the years ahead.

What worried me was the increase in the federal deficit of some 26 or 28 per cent. Somewhere along the road this has to be paid off, although we have been saying that for years and we seem to keep going merrily along with increasing deficits. It has always been my understanding that when one has a debt, at some point along the way one has to account for that.

I have certain reservations about the technique used, but we will certainly applaud the incentives that have been given to business and hope they will provide the spark and incentive to turn things around.

In the federal budget speech the issue of jobs was addressed. The provincial government recognizes that this is an area of great concern, which is why our own throne speech made reference to it.

I have had some words of encouragement from people in business and industry. For example, last Thursday the Ontario Research Foundation held a seminar in which I had the privilege of participating. People in both small and large businesses in Mississauga were invited

to come. There was a response from 70 or 80 people who came from a wide variety of small businesses, and a note of optimism permeated the meeting. This was encouraging.

I know things such as this—there are others I will touch on in a minute—are cold comfort to the person who simply does not have a job. But if there is this encouragement, this expansionism in industry, the end result and the spinoff from these various industries make for more jobs.

Another interesting event, held at noon today, was an announcement by Xerox at Ontario Place. They unveiled some new photocopiers and other products. They have a plant in Mississauga, it so happens, at the research foundation location. I note in the press release that Xerox Canada embarked on a vigorous Canadian value-added program nine years ago. At that time, there were only 14 employees in the manufacturing division. Today, more than 450 are working there. These are some of the additional jobs that have been created in Ontario and are mentioned from time to time by the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) and the Premier (Mr. Davis).

These are in the area of high technology and the production of computers and so on. One of the things I have been advocating is a program of training people in high technology, the software industries and so on. Such a program would be one of the best hopes for the future in training and retraining.

In the past I have mentioned the need to take a very hard look at matching the need for jobs with those jobs that are available, training our young people and retraining others who are out of work because of the changed economy and production so that these jobs will be available to them. This would seem to be one of the best hopes for our young people and others today.

I want to address a very sensitive problem that has been discussed in this House from time to time, the question of nuclear disarmament. It is not really within the ambit of provincial jurisdiction, or it has not been, but we are people too. We are Canadians. We are most interested in this.

There are very vocal activists in our western democracies who demonstrate in various ways and publicize their great concern over the nuclear weapons buildup. They, of course, advocate disarmament. That is all very well, and I agree with that, but not in any unilateral fashion. A call by these demonstrators for

disarmament by the west, seems to me to be missing in what I hear from demonstrations by those deeply concerned individuals.

3:50 p.m.

There is no doubt, if a void is made, the Russians will move in. There is an interesting quote from an article in the Sun regarding Valentyn Moroz, who spent nine years in Soviet prisons: "Anti-nuclear protesters are naïve if they believe the Soviets won't take advantage of western disarmament, a former Ukrainian political prisoner says." That, to me, is the key. If we can get the same message across in the eastern bloc of countries, then perhaps there would be some meaningful progress towards arms reduction.

The article quotes Moroz as going on to say that "demonstrators should picket in Moscow as well as in Toronto for peace and if they did, 'they would be arrested like I was.'" He also sends out the warning that "the Soviet Union would use western anti-nuclear sentiment to gain the upper hand."

There is a warning there. It is a concern I certainly share. I have as great a horror as anybody of nuclear war, or any other kind of war for that matter. One can think of the horrors of napalm flame-throwers and other conventional weapons and the horror and tragic cost of wars in general. With a nuclear war, obviously no one will win.

It was of some concern to me last fall when this question was placed on a municipal ballot. The vote came back at around 75 or 80 per cent support for disarmament. As I read a few reports, which were not all-encompassing or deeply researched, this seemed to be the overview of what transpired. The question must have been placed in some context that confused the voters who responded to it. For instance, I would have thought that 99.9 per cent plus of the respondents would be opposed to nuclear war, although that was not the question, and would be supportive of nuclear disarmament. It did not come through that way.

If the question included disarmament by all nations, I cannot conceive who would oppose it. I do not think any sane person either in an eastern or western nation would be opposed to that. I do not think citizens of any nation wish for war. If their leaders could get together and respond to what the people want, certainly we would be in for an era of peace and harmony.

As I have mentioned, there is no question that Russia has expansionist and imperialist ideas.

We know that. The Russians have demonstrated them. Afghanistan is one of the latest examples, as well as the mid-European countries. They make mischief in Africa and so on.

If they really want to give evidence that they are non-aggressive, why do they not pull out of Afghanistan? That would be an encouraging sign to both east and west, if it were verified and if it were not done in some fashion that such a withdrawal was simply a ploy to cause us in the west to let down our guard, because one thing the Russians do understand is strength and firmness. But the west must show integrity and honesty in negotiations.

I am reminded of when they moved into Cuba with their missiles. Jack Kennedy demonstrated the effectiveness of a policy of firmness and integrity when they placed those rockets there. He laid it on the line and as a result, they pulled out.

Think if those armaments were in place there today, 90 miles off the coast of the United States. Firmness was shown and it was obvious to them that this was not going to be allowed to go on. When they were withdrawn, the possibility of war diminished.

In my view, it is somewhat sad that right now the best possibility of preventing nuclear war or any other kind of war is to maintain military strength, military capability and a balance of power. I am one who advocates disarmament, but it has to be on a bilateral or multilateral basis. That is the message we have to get through to Moscow. We do not want to find ourselves with a modern-day Munich. We simply must match strength with strength.

Maybe it is a little naïve, but our own town of Mississauga has a twinning arrangement with a city in Japan. I guess it is encouraging that other cities in Canada do that. There is at least one in Alberta; there may be more. If we can do that, citizens of each nation could then get together.

Maybe it is a hopeless pipedream but, on the other hand, maybe it would be a small step towards showing some faith. The fact that we have the abhorrence of war that I am sure they do could be a small step towards harmony between east and west. I do not know, but these thoughts come to one who has a deep concern for our own nation and our own people, for this generation and for succeeding generations.

In any event, I am closing these few remarks to say that we must keep our western strength at a high level, because it is a time to remember

who our friends are while we continue to work for peace on a bipartisan, sincere, genuine, verifiable basis.

I want to turn back for a moment to a subject mentioned earlier, the economy. I believe the recession has bottomed out, but it is going to be a long, hard pull to get back to a satisfactory employment and economic plateau.

As has been indicated, the unemployment rate may run at a higher level than we enjoyed during the so-called good years of the past decade and more. I do not need to say these difficult times disfigure our economic stability and, accordingly, our social stability, but I see signs of a turnaround in housebuilding. I believe, despite reservations about the federal budget and its large deficit, it will help give the thrust it should. It should be the leading effort towards recovery.

4 p.m.

I had a gloomy forecast from an individual about so many young people out of work—and that is where the high rates of unemployment are—that possibly some young people never will be able to acquire jobs. Things have changed. It has been mentioned by some leading economists and politicians that instead of having an unemployment rate of three, three-and-a-half or four per cent, our way of life now is going to see six or seven per cent unemployed. That is cause for some despair.

With so many people coming on to the social programs, on public or social assistance, could we not move into an area where, through existing agencies, we could assist some of the elderly people who wish to remain in their own homes but who find the daily duties of home maintenance, the care that might be needed both within the house and outside, too onerous? This could be done on the basis of something like the foreign student programs, but this would be domestic. They might serve these elderly people and be paid for it and receive some benefits, some training and some experience in working in social areas.

This would have a two-point thrust. One, it would give meaningful responsibilities, work and duties to persons who otherwise are idle. There is nothing worse than idleness. Two, it would enable people to stay in their homes longer, rather than having to go into our overcrowded rest and retirement homes.

Mr. McClellan: Decent jobs with decent wages.

Mr. Kennedy: Relatively decent wages, whereby those who are attracted to it could combine it with work and work experience. Anything one learns can often open a door. The more experience a person has and can show on a résumé, the more opportunities may come about. It might be just that small, little extra that will get a young person into a career.

There is another suggestion I would like to put forward. As I travel along Highways 401 and 400, I note there is a very limited number of service centres. This is not the first time this matter has been raised in this chamber. We should get more competition out there and I think more opportunities should be provided. Such competition would be of benefit to tourists, to our tourism industry and to motorists.

It would start construction projects going and the spinoff from construction is tremendous. It would also be of great benefit to consumers. It could have a great appeal to tourist traffic coming into the province. There should be such facilities adjacent to more of these interchanges. I would like to see a forecast, some study or survey done, which would project the number of jobs that might spin off from that. I think there would be a considerable number.

We would have a response to the free market—that draws some attraction from the opposition. The free market would be at work. The competitive spirit would be at work. There would be benefits from the materials used in construction, ongoing jobs, the provision of consumer products such as accommodation and so on to the facilities.

There is one other subject I want to touch on and that is the provision of parking for handicapped persons. Last week I introduced, for the second or third time, a bill which would put in place some authority whereby parking for the handicapped would be provided across the province on a mandatory basis.

I did not know I had such empathy with the opposition party member for Halton-Burlington (Mr. J. A. Reed). The member made reference to the fact there is now a special licence plate.

Interjection.

Mr. Kennedy: I will not overdo this. I don't want to have remonstrations from our own whip, so I promise him I will not get carried away. It was a very good move by the Ministry of Transportation and Communications to provide licence plates for those handicapped who drive cars. That is very good, but what it does not do, of course, is ensure a parking space for those persons who want to park. There is a need

to define the issue of parking spots. Right now it is done on a municipal basis and some shopping centres provide this service on a voluntary basis, but I have had complaints about spaces being taken up by other cars.

There is also a problem if, for instance, one of us were to drive a handicapped person in our car to a shopping plaza. The car is not designated as being owned by a handicapped person. I would like to see each person who is eligible for such a parking facility have a form of identification which can be placed on the dashboard or visor which will give access to such a space to the person rather than the vehicle.

I hope the minister responsible, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Mr. Bennett), will take a look at this with a view to adding that extra bit that will mean so much to the people who are in need of those facilities. These facilities should be provided when the need is there for them. Not having them there, having them occupied by someone else, or having a limitation on them because when the handicapped people are being taken to whatever activity they are attending they are unable to be brought out at the proper door, does not help the people who have a need for these facilities.

With those few remarks I will close out by returning for a moment to the throne speech. On page 7, it says of the upcoming government programs, "Measures will be introduced to contribute to an enduring economic recovery which will create the jobs necessary to allow all Ontarians to lead productive lives, to strengthen the management of the province's affairs, and to respond to the critical concerns and needs of Ontarians."

Our throne speech is about our economic programs and I hope they will run in sympathy and empathy with the federal budget, which they describe as a national recovery program. I would like to be excused for a little cynicism, but halfway through the handouts that Mr. Lalonde was offering it occurred to me that maybe it is a Liberal recovery program. Perish the thought.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the opportunity to say a few words on behalf of the province and the great city of Mississauga.

NOTICE OF DISSATISFACTION

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Robinson): Before I recognize the member for Windsor-Sandwich, I have an announcement of great interest to the House. Pursuant to standing order 28, the

member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Laughren) has given notice of his dissatisfaction with the answer to his question given by the Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Drea) yesterday.

This matter will be debated at 10:30 p.m. this evening.

4:10 p.m.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(continued)

Mr. Wrye: Mr. Speaker, before I begin my remarks I would like to congratulate you on your promotion from the chairmanship of the standing committee on members' services to the chairmanship of the standing committee on social development. I trust your onerous task as chairman of that committee will be conducted in the same great, nonpartisan manner as in your previous task.

Mr. Conway: Where did Mr. Shymko go?

Mr. Wrye: He went to members' services and I have asked to be removed from that committee.

I want to suggest first, in making my remarks, that I appreciate the remarks of the previous speaker from the Conservative benches in so far as they gave proper praise and attention to the budget of my federal friend the Minister of Finance.

I wish I could reciprocate by saying I could find something of value in the speech from the throne. I have heard many as a journalist and this is my third as a member of this assembly. I regret this speech from the throne is perhaps the worst I have ever heard, either as a provincial member or a journalist, coming either from a provincial assembly or a federal assembly. There is absolutely nothing in this speech, just as there appears to be absolutely nothing this government has to offer the people of Ontario.

The months of neglect and negligence are turning into years. As my leader has suggested, it may turn into a decade of decline. As I stand in my place on this Tuesday of what some believe may be a momentous week in terms of the political climate of this province and this country, it seems to me one of the reasons the speech from the throne was so lacking in initiative is that there has been little initiative by this government as it awaits a decision by its leader, which I hope will be taken soon so that we can get back to the business of getting some progress in this province.

I want to speak on a number of issues in my remarks today. Perhaps a good place to start

would be the bicentennial, because it is something the government has certainly not neglected. It is something which I think has added to the level of cynicism a great many people in this province feel.

Rather than use my own remarks, I want to plagiarize and read to the members a letter I received from a constituent of mine. It says it so much better than I could. The letter is dated April 20.

"Dear Sir:

"It has come to my attention that in 1984 the provincial Conservative government intends to celebrate a bicentennial—to the early Loyalists who came to Canada to escape the American Revolution—and to spend \$11 million to have a party.

"They had better get their facts first. The Loyalists did migrate to Canada during 1789 to 1791. Those wealthy gentry, 3,300, purchased their passage back to England, leaving the others to live prudently within frugal means. A United Empire Loyalist association was formed in Upper Canada in 1897. Therefore, this provincial government is historically incorrect in advising this event for 1984."

Now we get to the pertinent part. "Question: Is this a political ploy to have this happy party one year before an election, a coincidence?" I leave that to the members to answer. "It is appalling for any government to spend \$11 million for such a reason during these poor economic times. It has no justification whatsoever."

As I said, I am just reading this nice lady's letter.

"Eleven million dollars could be put to better use in establishing 11 factories in 11 financially strapped communities in Ontario, by building up a 100-man work force, taking people off unemployment and making them taxpayers, and putting commemorative brass or nickel plates on the doors or walls of these factories saying, 'In memory of the early Loyalists,' etc."

This lady has more ideas than this government.

"Question: Is the present government going to borrow this \$11 million from the Bank of Canada to have this party? If this is true, then the residents of Ontario have a right to know about this future debt. Lord, even a minted coin would be sufficient and much easier to swallow." It is signed, "An ordinary homemaker" and she has underlined "Eleven million dollars!" This is not in my riding, but I certainly endorse and understand the reasons for her frustration

and the reason she would write that letter in the first place.

I want to address a variety of issues, and I will start with the issues I have direct responsibility for as the Labour critic for the Liberal Party and as women's critic for the party. I will not address all the issues, but I will touch on three. The first is the promise in the speech from the throne—and it was perhaps the only substantive thing that came from the throne speech—that we are going to get a senior minister responsible for women's issues with a complete mandate to review, initiate, direct and promote policies favourable to and in support of women in Ontario society.

Since the throne speech, we have had no indication that such a minister is about to be named, but I will wait in breathless anticipation to see which of the progressive Tories over there will be handed this task of burying and obfuscating issues that are of so much concern to so many.

Mr. Laughren: Either Henderson or Gregory.

Mr. Wrye: I will not even speculate on names. It would be unfair to speculate on names. I might suggest some minister who would be in some way progressive and that would immediately rule out that minister.

When that minister is named and when that legislation is in place, let me suggest that the new women's minister could start by having a little look at the annual report of the women crown employees office. It points out that in 1982-83 the wage gap for women crown employees was reduced by 1.6 per cent. The minister has taken considerable pride in pointing out that the gap has now been narrowed to the extent that women get 73.6 per cent of men's wages within the Ontario civil service.

What is a more important number, and I will explain why in a minute, is the number of female executives within the Ontario civil service, which has increased by a much smaller proportion, from 6.3 per cent to 6.9 per cent. The total number of women who fill senior executive positions in the Ontario civil service numbers a grand total of 40.

I suspect the reason we have had something of a narrowing of the gap is not so much because of the affirmative action policies of this government, and of each ministry within this government, but because the collective agreements the Ontario Public Service Employees Union was able to negotiate, and which were implemented during the year just past, allowed for some narrowing of the gap. The collective

agreements that were negotiated presented fairly substantial wage increases.

I suspect we will find in this coming year there will be a significant slowing of the narrowing process. I suggest that because there is no indication from any of the figures I have seen in the report that the narrowing of the gap had anything to do with women moving up within the civil service structure, which is the goal the government ought to have established some time ago.

If I were to suggest just a couple of matters for the senior minister who is ultimately appointed to handle women's issues within this government, the first matter that must be addressed is equal pay legislation. That has been promised for some time and yet no legislation has come forward. Quite significantly, there was no mention of it in the speech from the throne other than as one area this minister might look at.

4:20 p.m.

A second area that ought to be of great concern to the minister, whoever he or she may be—and I will just use this second one briefly—is the government's dismal record in its voluntary affirmative action program. I remember speaking at length on this last fall during the estimates and addressing a number of questions to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Ramsay), and I urged the new minister to look at the updated figures.

The figures that were presented to us indicated that in the 850 largest companies in Ontario, after six or seven years this grand affirmative action program that the government has put together has managed to attract some affirmative action initiative from some 225 firms. Indeed, the worst offenders—and it really quite appalled me—are the so-called public firms which are receiving a great deal of their money from the taxpayers, and I would include among them municipalities, school boards and the like. I thought it was a particularly dismal record and it is a concern that the new minister of women's issues must address right at the outset.

I want to return to the throne speech of a year ago and see if I can refresh the memory of the House by reading a brief excerpt from it. This is the throne speech of March 9, 1982.

"Ontario will continue to seek fairness and balance in management-labour relations throughout the province. As a result, in consultation with the ministries of Labour and Industry and Trade Development, measures to provide protection for employees under the Employment

Standards Act will be advanced in such areas as unjust dismissal and protection of severance pay."

I think those who were expecting this legislation should get that aspect of the speech framed. Significantly, this year that promise was not even mentioned, yet all of us know that in these very difficult economic times there has been an increased need, not a decreased need, for tough new legislation to protect employees throughout the province, particularly those who are not given the protection of the trade union movement, from unjust dismissal.

Too often constituents who are not covered by collective bargaining agreements have come to my office with very sad cases of unjust dismissal, and the amount of money that can be garnered from the employer in these cases is, as members of the assembly know, minimal.

I want to offer the House some specific numbers to show the inadequacy of the present severance pay legislation. I should point out that I have introduced a private member's bill that addresses one small aspect of it; I hope to introduce other bills as the session progresses. I introduced the legislation, as most honourable members do, not so much to pretend that we on this side are playing government as to signal to the minister that there is a problem and a very grave concern that needs to be rectified.

Figures we received from Harry Shardlow, who is in the plant closure and adjustment section of the Ministry of Labour, indicate that between January 1, 1981—and the legislation we passed in 1981 was retroactive—and September 30, 1982, in regular cases, which I would describe as being nonbankruptcy, nonreceivership cases, the number of employees who were terminated according to the current severance pay legislation was 4,540. Of that number, under the government's current legislation only 1,865 were eligible for severance pay, and those cases came to a grand total of 35.

I will point out—and I want to be fair—that the number of employees who actually received benefits was 3,196, so clearly some employers chose in spite of the legislation to be more generous. It is very interesting that the business community would recognize in some way the inadequacy of the legislation but that this government will not.

Even more bothersome was the number of employees terminated in bankruptcy and receivership cases. There were a total of 20 of those which fell under the purview of this legislation. The number of employees who were terminated

in these instances totalled just over 3,000—3,012, to be exact.

The number eligible for benefits under the government's program was only 1,700, again just barely over half. The number of employees who actually received benefits, and this is truly disturbing, was zero. Not one employee. It seems to me it is high time this minister and this government sat down and re-examined the severance pay legislation and brought in the appropriate changes. Clearly the legislation that the former Minister of Labour said would establish a floor of protection for all employees across this province has certainly not done that.

I want to turn to some health issues, if I might, for a minute. I want to do so in the knowledge that the budget will be coming down about this time one week from today. The first issue I want to touch on is the issue of user fees.

There has been some talk emanating from this government, talk which is accompanied by the usual fed-bashing, that perhaps we will have to bring in user fees for those who are unfortunate enough to go into the hospitals of this province, and the reason we will have to do so is that Ottawa is strangling the health care system.

I always find it rather humorous that this government, which has strangled the health care system itself, which strangled the post-secondary education system, now accuses Ottawa, which simply wishes to get things back into balance, of strangulation. I mean, after all, 55 cents out of every dollar is really quite adequate.

I wanted to read a brief comment from Mr. Gordon Cunningham, the executive director of the Ontario Hospital Association, because I thought it was very enlightening. He says, in a very recent For Your Information, dated April 20: "At our liaison meeting with the Minister of Health yesterday our president pointed out that to be cost effective user fees would need to be very substantial. Obviously this would have the potential of generating social and political backlash"—you had better believe that—"i.e. taxing the sick, the disabled, poor and the aged population. However, unless hospitals could charge a substantial amount, we do not see any justification for collecting user fees.

"On the other hand, modest user fees would produce relatively little revenue and have little or no impact on decreasing utilization. Except for emergency visits, patients do not decide whether or not they will be admitted to hospital. Further, imposition of modest user fees could raise collection and administrative costs. Hospi-

tals do not need additional costs thrust on them at this time."

I would hope that the words of Mr. Cunningham would have reached the ears of the Minister of Health (Mr. Grossman) and that he will have managed to talk his friend the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) out of any suggestion that we will follow the very ill-timed and ill-advised lead of Alberta, which also has a Conservative government, in bringing user fees into our hospital system. They are simply unfair. They are regressive and they speak to everything that would be mean in terms of our system of health care. It would be another gigantic step back in a system which has seen too many steps back in the last few years.

Mr. Cunningham: It is also a dumb idea.

Mr. Wrye: As my friend from Wentworth North suggests, it is also a dumb idea, but then again that is what bothers me about this government. Dumb ideas appear to be ideas which they have entertained in the years I have been here.

I also want to make a couple of comments on Ontario health insurance plan premiums. I want my friends to my left to understand the position of our party, since they so conveniently fail to understand the position of the party on this matter.

4:30 p.m.

My leader pointed out very clearly—because once again, unlike our friends to my left, we do not try to play government; I know they do—there would certainly be some question in our minds, given the present restraint legislation, as to whether the government of Ontario would have any right to increase OHIP premiums by more than five per cent.

Those remarks and questions were asked after the Treasurer, once again verbally wandering through the course of his budget deliberations, suggested there might be OHIP premium increases far in excess of that amount. But it would be my view, and it is a view of our party, there should be no increase whatsoever in OHIP premiums in this budget. It is very clearly on the record that the view of our party is that we would gradually phase out premiums in this province, premiums which are now by far the highest in Canada, and would move those over to the more progressive taxation system.

On a number of occasions I have dealt with people in my riding who have needed assistance with premiums and I find the level of premiums which they are asked to pay on a very modest

income, somewhere in the low teens in thousands, is really quite disgraceful.

I would hope the Treasurer would begin to understand it is absolutely unfair and, again, totally regressive to increase OHIP premiums. I for one would hope that we would not hear the Treasurer stand in his place and increase OHIP premiums because he needs to pay for the doctors' fee increase. He knows full well what he could have done with the medical profession. He could have done with them what he did with every other public servant in Ontario. It is a profession that is getting support from public tax dollars. One can call them independent businessmen, one can call them anything one wants, but the fact is, with the vast majority, their income is from the public sector and from the public purse. As such, they should have fallen under the restraint program.

There is absolutely no reason that they should have been exempted from the rollback considering that this government chose to roll back a number of other increases.

I understand that. I supported that very, very reluctantly. I understand that ultimately in my vote I obviously have a very honest difference of opinion with my friends to my left. But it seems to me that this government has—and I would suggest to some extent my friends on the left are being consistent as are we. The only inconsistent group is this present government.

While dealing with health issues, I would be remiss if I did not raise again an issue that has bothered me ever since I first ran for elected office. I promise this government I will raise it until they are out and we are in and then we will act on it. It is the need for a chronic care hospital in the city of Windsor.

I just want to read from a report in the Windsor Star, Wednesday, April 27, 1983; less than one week ago.

"It is now or never for a new chronic care hospital in Windsor," frustrated officials of Windsor Western Hospital said Tuesday.

"In an emotional appeal at Tuesday's hospital board meeting, board chairman J. E. Fettes said the Essex County District Health Council"—that appendage of the ministry—"has failed to understand the need to replace Riverview Hospital and he has little hope for support from the other four area hospitals.

"Every major community in this province has got a chronic care hospital either under way or already built. We don't."

And further on, "It seems that chronic care is relegated to second class or third class citizen-

ship.” That remark is from the executive director of Windsor Western, James Broderick.

The chronic care facility in Windsor we have talked about, the 296-bed facility, has been on the drawing board and has been approved in principle for 12 years. Yet this government cannot find the funding necessary to give us that very long overdue and important facility.

It has gone on so long, the price tag has gone up to between between \$25 million and \$35 million. A lot of money, it is said. That is correct. It is a lot of money. Let me give two indications why it would be money well spent.

The old Riverview facility has no business being a hospital at all. It is a disgrace. It is one of the most disgraceful facilities this ministry has any jurisdiction over. That hospital will need \$1 million in the next year just to upgrade fire and safety standards. Is that not wonderful in 1983?

If Riverview is to be used much longer, it will need at least another \$7 million in renovations. That is almost one third of the cost of building a new building. Why do we not get on with the job of getting a new chronic care facility?

The other reason we should get on with the job is Riverview has only 150 beds. We are talking about a new facility which would have some 300 beds. By doing that, we could get rid of the great burden that has been placed on all the hospitals in Windsor of having improperly placed patients, chronic care patients in active treatment beds. That is a problem which the minister himself acknowledged in a letter to me. He acknowledged it has resulted on a number of occasions in patients lying for up to 72 hours in hallways or emergency wards, a situation that is surely intolerable.

As this board chairman said, and he is absolutely correct: “I do not accept there is a higher priority item in the province of Ontario than a new chronic care hospital for Windsor. I just do not accept that.”

He rejects the idea the province has no money for new projects, pointing out that three major hospital projects in Toronto went to tender in the last few days. I say to this government it is about time we got on with the job of giving Windsor the chronic care hospital this government promised 12 long years ago.

I want to speak briefly about the cancellation of the Ontario home renewal program. I learned about it not through any announcement by this government because, boy, when it cancels programs, it does not tell anybody about it. I learned almost by accident, through the municipality in which I reside and which I represent,

that a program the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Mr. Bennett) concurs in a letter to me has been a very effective program, was cancelled last year and \$10.5 million of funding was taken out of the program.

In my letter to the minister, I pointed out this program is important for those in my community and all across this province, a goodly number in my community alone. There is a total of 300 applications now on file from those who need their houses brought up to minimum standards. We are not talking about Casa Lomas here. We are talking about houses that lack even the minimum standards designed by our community. It is important those houses be brought up to a minimum standard.

As well, we could put hundreds and thousands of people back to work if we were to restore this program. Yet this government blamed the cancellation of the program on the restraint program. The Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, in his letter to me, had the gall to say: “I understand Windsor now receives \$10,000 to \$12,000 per month in OHRP repayments. As you see, OHRP can continue.”

It certainly can, for one and a half applications a month. We have 300 on file. There are 175 of an emergency nature and the minister says that \$10,000 a month will suffice. Maybe he ought to give up a few of his advertising bucks and start putting the money where we can create jobs.

4:40 p.m.

I just want to read the end of an editorial which the editor of the Windsor Star wrote on this matter.

“The government cites restraint as the justification for axing the program, but already it looks like a false economy.

“If substandard housing cannot be brought up to the minimum standards because the owners cannot afford it, and the construction industry is deprived of a healthy chunk of its business, it is inevitable that sooner or later there will be greater demands on provincially-funded social services.”

The only people this government, the great friend of business, of the small independent businessman, cares about are its advertising buddies who get more from this government.

I want to deal very briefly with two final items. The first is a problem which has been brought to my attention in my community, but it is a problem all members ought to be aware of and sensitive to. That is the fact this very generous government is not generous enough in

terms of the welfare and social assistance areas. I am speaking specifically about the special assistance program now in place in so many municipalities.

I will read from a background report about my own municipality:

"Special assistance covers such items as special diets, cost of care and maintenance in a nursing home, prescribed drugs, surgical supplies and dressings, dental services, prosthetic appliances, vocational training, travel and transportation, moving and funeral and burial."

The list goes on.

In my own community, the social services department has been very understanding and very sensitive to many of the needs of my constituents—needs to literally put food on the table. The only problem with this is that this government, which has so much money for so many other things, has no money for special assistance.

Fifty per cent of the money is sent to the municipality under subsection 15(5) of the regulation under the General Welfare Assistance Act. The funding for special assistance is such that municipalities are reimbursed 50 per cent of the amounts paid to or on behalf of a person in need of special assistance by Ontario.

Conveniently, that is the amount Ottawa gives to Ottawa in the first place. How many dollars come out of Ontario's pocket? Not one dollar comes from this province. How can that be important? In the last three years, payment by the city of Windsor for special assistance items has totalled \$1,903,000. Because of the great recession we have had in my community, and I am sure it is the same in so many others, that has increased annually, until last year the total amount paid was \$877,000. Of that, the actual cost to the city has been \$951,000.

Just to put it in dollar terms, in terms of the estimate of what it will cost for special assistance this year, if the province were to pick up its 30 per cent share and leave the municipality with its 20 per cent share, with the general revenues and the much wider scope the province has in collecting taxation, they could save the city of Windsor—which is already strapped and very desperate for money—\$260,000 this year alone.

I urge the government to do this. This special assistance is a program which is so very important in these difficult economic times.

I want to give members one small, personal example about the head of a family in my riding who, because of the very poor economy, has not

been able to find employment. The family is on welfare. They have had an enormous amount of tragedy in the family, including deaths of their parents on both sides.

They have a young lad who is nine years old and he suffers from a rare chronic lung disease, the name of which I cannot even pronounce. He gets protein fluid in his lungs which then must be drained. That operation can only occur in Toronto at the Hospital for Sick Children. On a regular basis and, indeed, the most recent occasion was just last week, that little boy must come to Toronto. His mother or his father come with him, because it is a very critically dangerous operation at any time.

Because of the family's financial situation, every time he comes down the people at social services in my community, through special assistance, pay the cost of transportation to and from Toronto. They have also paid for the modest cost of boarding that family while they are in Toronto, at Ronald McDonald House, I believe. That is just one example of why that program cannot be cut back. There is simply no money elsewhere for that young lad. I hope the government will take a very serious look at fulfilling its responsibilities in the field of special assistance.

I will close by returning to a subject I raised last year. I see my friend the member for Oshawa (Mr. Breaugh) is here. On many occasions last year he raised the problem of those who have families with or who have Alzheimer's disease. To refresh the memory of the House, I will put it on the record that we have in this country an estimated 200,000 Canadians over 65 who suffer from the disease, including 73,000 in this province and 3,000 in my own community. It causes some 10,000 fatalities a year, and is believed to be the fourth most common cause of death.

The disease was initially diagnosed 75 years ago. For those who do not know, it attacks the brain cells, impairing memory, judgement and intellect. Related to these effects are anxiety and depression.

I note that the Alzheimer Society—and I believe there is now a full Ontario chapter—will be here at Queen's Park later this month, I believe on May 17, two weeks from today, to meet with us. I urge all members from all parties to get together with them. I also at this time want to urge the government to take some action. The ministers well know that the society, particularly our local chapter, has been urging action for some time.

I will read a brief letter the Minister of Health (Mr. Grossman) wrote to Mrs. Marilyn Brown, who is co-chairperson of the local Windsor and Essex county Alzheimer chapter. It is dated June 29, 1982. In that letter the Minister of Health says:

"Ministry of Health staff have attended meetings of the Alzheimer Society where concerns such as those of your membership were raised. When the Mental Health Act is open for amendment, this issue will be among the first to be considered for change."

I will leave it at this. I hope that act will be open soon for amendment. The disease is a great tragedy that is visited upon too many people throughout this province, and it is a tragedy that is compounded by a real problem that the government is well aware of. It seems to me it would be appropriate for this government to move and perhaps bring to the attention of these people when they come to Toronto on May 17 the happy news that there will be appropriate amendments to the Mental Health Act.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the opportunity to speak in this throne speech debate. I regret that the throne speech contained so little. One can only hope that the budget one week hence will contain a little more.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Cousens): I thank the honourable member, and recognize the member for Lincoln.

Mr. Andrewes: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the co-operation of the member for Lake Nipigon (Mr. Stokes) in deferring to me and allowing me to find my way to another event later on this afternoon. I am proud, as a member of this government, to speak in support of the speech from the throne.

I was particularly pleased to see the appointment of a senior minister to be responsible for women's issues proposed in His Honour's address. I was glad to hear the member for Windsor-Sandwich (Mr. Wrye) make his comments with respect to that issue, and I hope I can perhaps expand on some of his earlier remarks.

It is a necessary and important step. It proves something very fundamental about the attitude of this government. The number and proportion of women in the Ontario labour force has increased dramatically over the past decade. In 1960, women made up only 28 per cent of the total work force, and by 1982 this figure had increased to 42.6 per cent. The fact that women now make up such a large part of the entire labour force represents a profound social change,

which calls for a change in traditional thinking about the role of women, jobs and careers.

4:50 p.m.

Although the participation rate of women has increased significantly, many misconceptions persist. Misconceptions about the role of women in the labour force can be either directly or indirectly connected to the assumption that women are secondary workers. It is suggested that the contribution made by working women to the economy and to their families is less important than that of working men. A further misconception is that working women are not truly dependent on such income and therefore do not suffer unduly if unemployed.

I ask the honourable members to consider the following facts. Over 40 per cent of married women in the Canadian labour force in 1978 had husbands who earned less than \$15,000 a year. Obviously, these working women are making an important and essential contribution to their family income. It is estimated that the number of poor families in Canada would almost double if women in two-partner families left the labour force.

In 1980 almost 40 per cent of working women in Ontario were either single, widowed or divorced, and these women are working to support themselves and, in many cases, dependants as well. So without question, women are making an important contribution to our society and a very tangible contribution to family income.

An example that comes immediately to mind, a situation that is very close to me and to my constituency, is a group known as the Niagara Grape Growers' Action Committee. This group was established in 1976 by the wives of grape growers in the Niagara area. The action committee was formed during a period of surplus grape production to promote the sale of Ontario-grown grapes and grape products. This group of 300 women has been most successful in promoting the consumption of Ontario grapes, wines and grape juice in the home, in schools, at community functions, at grape and wine festivals and at conventions both in Canada and in the United States.

By the way, the action committee also paved the way for Ontario wine to be introduced as one of the house wines at the parliamentary restaurant in—where else?—Ottawa. That, I would suggest, is in direct contrast to the rather enlightened and progressive spirit of our own Queen's Park facilities, and I would suggest that perhaps at this time it is appropriate to remind

all honourable members of the opportunity this evening to sample those products at a very pleasant and social event that we will participate in later on.

There are many serious and immediate issues that will have to be addressed by the new minister responsible for women. Inequities exist in the occupational and salary status of women. In 1979 women working full time earned on the average 63.3 per cent of what men working full time earn.

Mr. McClellan: What are you preaching for, Phil?

Mr. Andrewes: I had never thought of it that way, but it is not a bad idea.

Child-bearing and child-rearing responsibilities have been one of the major factors inhibiting the participation and advancement of women in the labour force. The new minister will need to re-evaluate the availability of accessible and affordable quality child care.

More than two thirds of all female workers in Canada are concentrated in just four occupational categories: clerical, service, medicine and health, and teaching. Emphasis will have to be placed on greater opportunity for women to enter nontraditional and higher-paying job sectors. In addition, an issue of increasing importance that will have to be addressed, not only by our government but also by industry and labour, is the impact of new technology on our labour force, particularly its effect on women.

I am pleased, therefore, that our government has taken the initiative to undertake an extensive and serious study of the impact of new technologies, so that we can respond in a positive and effective manner to technological change. It is fair to say that Canada, and more specifically Ontario, finds itself lagging behind most western industrial economies in the diffusion of new technologies.

It has been estimated, for example, that Canada is four or more years behind its major competitors in the use of CAD/CAM technology. In robotics, Canada and Ontario trail all major industrial nations in both installation and manufacturing. There are approximately 200 robots in use throughout Canada today, compared to about 5,000 to 10,000 in the United States and over 25,000 in Japan.

The effect of these technology gaps would in itself be serious enough in the technical expertise loss to our nation, but the real consequences of such a situation show up in our declining productivity and ultimately in our ability to

compete. Given Canada's declining tariff levels, the consequences of a widening technology gap with our major trading partners become painfully obvious.

Two major short-term limitations impeding the diffusion of technology are ignorance, fear of the technology, and a simple lack of interest in its potential uses. Concerned with overcoming this handicap, Ontario has set up five technology centres to assist key sectors of the economy to become aware of the advantages of new technologies, such as microelectronics, CAD/CAM, and robotics.

I strongly believe that a key requirement in accelerating the use of these new technologies will be an understanding of the effects on the labour force. Ignorance often leads to fear, and there are those who fear technology because they can only think of it in terms of sophisticated machines, thus mistaking the shell for the snail, or the web for the spider.

We must remember that technology is not always machines but it is knowledge, knowledge that is stored in hundreds of millions of books, and in hundreds of millions or billions of human heads. Technology is knowledge of how to do things, of how to accomplish human goals, in order to achieve and improve the quality of life. Technology as stored knowledge enhances our abilities to accomplish individual and collective goals, such as providing the information to combat disease, or to discover new techniques in detecting and controlling pollution.

Our goals will be achieved through the application of more technology, not less. Ignorance of the implications of high technology has also been largely responsible for generating fear of massive unemployment. To understand the problem of unemployment and labour adjustment, we must appreciate that technological change is a two-edged sword. On the one hand it leads to the creation of completely new industries and occupations, and on the other it can lead to the displacement of labour through increases in efficiency in existing processes and in producing and delivering goods and services.

The spectrum of prediction about the possible impact of the new technology upon employment runs from the optimistic view that in the long run the new employment generated by new technologies will balance, or exceed, that which it will displace, to the pessimistic view that by the end of the century the majority of the labour force will be displaced by robots and automation.

The truth is that no one can be absolutely

certain about long-term employment trends. However, in the next five to 10 years the effects of technology in reducing industry's demands for labour are unlikely to be any more dramatic than those of many previous examples of technological improvement.

5 p.m.

Alvin Toffler describes the great waves or flows of economic forces. The current transition from a goods-producing economy to a service or information-producing economy is equivalent to the 19th-century transition from an agrarian-based economy to an industrial one.

Today more than 50 per cent of the labour force in the western industrial countries are classified as information handlers. The new technology, particularly microelectronics, is geared directly to reducing the labour required to handle information. Studies done in Europe estimate losses of 30 per cent of the work force over the 1980s in sectors such as banking, insurance and the postal service.

Such negative predictions are also borne out by recent studies in Canada. The Public Service Alliance of Canada reports that two jobs are lost for every one created in technology-related administrative positions in the federal government. Heather Menzies in her book *Women and the Chip* concludes that unemployment among women could reach 35 per cent by 1990 if information technology is allowed to impinge unhampered on the office environment.

Increasingly there is a recognition that women will be affected most by the changes brought about by technology. The areas in which women have come to be employed are going to be the areas most affected in the future, because the office of the future, for example, will be expected to be composed of a wide range of computer-based equipment. Word processing equipment is now capable of retyping, filing, addressing and typesetting as well as providing electronic mail, messaging and agenda planning with on-line communication links.

The new office equipment will require a quantum leap in the talents and the skills required; and instead of people to process information and follow procedures, the new office will need to invent new ways of processing and applying processed information and to create new procedures for computers to follow.

Some analysts have argued that the effect microelectronics will have on women is paradoxical. First-generation office machines such as the typewriter and the telephone switchboard

gave women the opportunity to enter the working world, and now computers have made these machines obsolete and have closed off traditional jobs. Hardship will be inevitable for many now employed in office jobs. But in the longer term, microelectronics will diminish the physical advantage of male muscle, opening up more occupations to females, and in the final analysis there is no agreement about what effects new technology will have on jobs.

So the various sides in the debate have been promoting their own interests and have made little effort to dispassionately analyse what will happen to jobs as a result of the introduction of new technology. There is not enough evidence to show a great displacement of labour in the information sector, and most figures are extrapolated or manipulated to confirm a particular set of hypotheses.

On the other side of the labour issue is the shortage of skilled labour. The Ontario Manpower Commission estimates that for the next five years we could suffer a shortage of engineers, computer operators, programmers, technicians and technologists. Education and training are the most universally accepted solutions for women and men whose traditional jobs become obsolete. Women will be encouraged to take courses in mathematics, science and technical skills.

Last year only 8.2 per cent of Canada's 34,155 undergraduate engineering students were women, and in the small but faster-growing sector of computer engineering only three of the 85 students of the 1985 graduating class are women.

Our government has taken the first step in responding to the challenge of technological change by undertaking to understand the effects such technology will have on our people. The study will seriously address the impact of technology on quantity and quality of employment; sectoral consideration, that is, which sectors of the economy are likely to be most affected; and, most important, retraining, the retraining of women currently in the work place and the training of those who wish to enter.

In undertaking to study the implications of technology, our government does not dismiss the fact that the loss of employment can be devastating to individuals and society, because work is the main means by which we relate to each other and acquire a sense of dignity and purpose, regardless of how hard or boring the work is.

Finally, it is the attitude that women have

towards themselves and their role in the work place that will effectively determine the success of these programs since for many years these attitudes have been dominated by a male influence. Women should not attain positions merely because they are women and there is a quota to fill, but because they are best qualified for the job. In understanding the challenges that are facing us, we can effectively plan for the future.

In closing, I urge all honourable members to support the policies and programs outlined in the speech from the throne. They reflect our government's genuine concern and commitment to the wellbeing of our people.

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Speaker, I want to be kind of parochial, and some might even say insular, in my comments in the throne speech debate. I want to remind all honourable members that the only reference to the north in the throne speech, however vague, however oblique, was some brief mention of the government's concern for one-industry towns in northern Ontario.

We have heard that song before. We know there are a good many one-industry towns based on a primary resource in the north that have had the boom-or-bust mentality for many years, given the nature of an economy so inextricably tied to one of the three primary resource sectors, namely, forestry, mining or tourism.

I am glad there are three northern members on the other side of the House, namely, the member for Timiskaming (Mr. Havrot), the member for Algoma-Manitoulin (Mr. Lane) and the member for Cochrane North (Mr. Piché). I would like their attention over the next little while in coming to grips with a problem that has emerged since a letter was sent by the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Bernier) to the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Pope) on December 14, 1982, dealing specifically with what could be mildly referred to as a slap on the wrist from the old crow, the Minister of Northern Affairs, to the relatively young and inexperienced Minister of Natural Resources. The Globe and Mail characterized that impasse, that hiatus, that difference of opinion, that parting of the ways, as a Tory tussle for a northern fief.

5:10 p.m.

It seems to me, as a member who has represented the north for almost 16 years, that for most of those years the Ministry of Natural Resources and its predecessor, the old Department of Lands and Forests, have had an ongoing road show or circus dealing with strategic land

use planning. They have had that exercise going in various forms for most of the past 15 years.

They have had advisory committees to district foresters, regional directors, regional staff and the minister himself. In a more intensive way over the last five to six years, they have embarked upon this strategic land use plan in general terms for the entire province. They have refined that to where we now have district land use plans covering all the activities on crown land and water wherever they exist throughout Ontario.

The Minister of Natural Resources has fine-tuned this. He has even got involved himself by having his little road show across the province where he lays claim to having talked to well over 3,000 people, getting their input and consulting with them as to the nature of strategic land use planning throughout Ontario.

In tandem with the land use planning process and exercise throughout the province, we have had a special task force dealing with planning for future parks across Ontario. Most members will know that we have about 134 provincial parks in a variety of sizes, kinds and uses. In the candidate options that now are being studied by the Ministry of Natural Resources, if all those candidate options were exercised, it would increase the number of parks in the province from 134 to something in the neighbourhood of 240.

We have lobbyists, environmentalists and wilderness people on one side of the issue and timber interests, mining interests and tourist interests on the other side of the issue. In the middle, I think it is safe to say, we have the Ministry of Natural Resources. Now the Minister of Northern Affairs is jumping into the fray, saying we must have a multiple-use concept in Ontario if we are going to maximize the benefit of the wise use of our land and water resources in the province.

What does the Minister of Northern Affairs have to say about this process that his colleague the Minister of Natural Resources has been involved in ever since he has become the minister? As a matter of fact, the present Minister of Northern Affairs, in a previous incarnation as the Minister of Natural Resources, was involved in the same process. He, along with the former member for Leeds and the former member for Cochrane North, who were also either Minister of Natural Resources or Minister of Lands and Forests, in a very personal and a very direct way was involved in the very process that is now the responsibility of his

colleague the Minister of Natural Resources, now the member for Cochrane South.

I want to quote from a letter that was sent from the Minister of Northern Affairs to the Minister of Natural Resources: "Plans or Guidelines: During the current discussions about land use plans, the question has come up as to what exactly they are intended to be. They have been described as catalogues of resources, guidelines, blueprints for decision-making and as plans in the sense of official plans setting out very precise rules and prescriptions of what can and cannot be done.

"The word 'plan' today carries with it the connotation of something that is etched in stone and very difficult, if not impossible, to change. Unfortunate, but true. This frankly is the case with most officials in most ministries I know. Presented with a plan to administer, the provisions become iron-clad rules that have to be applied according to the letter of the law. Occasionally they become reasons for not doing things. Proposals that are at variance are looked at suspiciously at best.

"In the coming years in the north the major emphasis must be on the creative and inventive use of our resources for the benefit of northerners rather than on the custodial nonuse side of the ledger. To do this, we in government are going to need the ability to respond flexibly to rapidly changing circumstances and to take advantage of unforeseen opportunities.

"A rigid plan will not permit this. I strongly recommend, therefore, that whatever documents come forward be called guidelines and that the administrative system within MNR be geared to dealing with them as such. This shift"—and I emphasize this, Mr. Speaker—"would provide greater flexibility for the government, would project publicly a sense of flexibility, would create a much better public image in the north and would frankly be much more consistent with what I understand the intent of the plan is supposed to be."

The Minister of Northern Affairs obviously is trying to intercede with his colleague the Minister of Natural Resources to say, "You must shift your whole emphasis of structured, rigid plans for a design for development and for strategic land use planning across the province to something that can loosely be referred to as guidelines so that we keep our options open with most of these things and it is a lot easier to justify than something that is etched in stone by way of a strategic land use plan or a district land use plan in Ontario."

The Minister of Northern Affairs talks about the multiple use concept; that is where everybody has a kick at the cat, perhaps in sequence at different times, at different stages of the growth of the ecosystems.

5:20 p.m.

I think the minister would have us believe that if we have a forest that is there for the cutting we let the timber companies go in there, clear-cut and do what they have been doing for the last 50 or 60 years. Then, when they are finished, we have a sort of a sequential use where we will give it to birdwatchers or photographers or backpackers, hikers, canoeists or whoever wants to use it after we have taken the primary product, that is, the timber resources.

In terms of the multiple-use concept, if I had the time I could go into very great detail about what is wrong with the present government's concept of multiple use. In theory, if it was done in such a way that if a timber company went into a given area, regardless of what standing timber was on it, if it was harvested in such a way that we would minimize the effect of that mechanical harvesting, it would in theory be possible to have a multiple-use concept. But in actual practice—I wish we could have a tour of northern members within the next couple of weeks or so, so I could take them up to areas that have just recently been cut and are in the process of being cut, to see what the forest industries concept of multiple use really is.

I could take them to Lake Savant, just north of the north line of the Canadian National Railways, where Great Lakes Forest Products Ltd. has its operations, and show them areas where, notwithstanding the fact that we have under the Crown Timber Act, under the manual of management, guidelines not only for personnel within the Ministry of Natural Resources but guidelines which are supposed to be incorporated into multi-year management plans for a given area, as well as actual year-to-year operation plans, that is not being done.

There will not be clear-cutting. At the time they plan to harvest an area they will set in motion a plan on not only how it is going to be harvested but how that particular stand is going to be managed, whether it will be cut selectively or whether it will be block-cut or strip-cut, whatever way professional foresters in their wisdom decide, even before harvesting, is the best way of planning for the natural regeneration of that forest. If it is not possible for that particular forest, that particular stand, that particular species, to regenerate itself naturally,

one sets in a motion a plan as to how one does that with human and financial resources to regenerate it by artificial means such as planting, seeding, that kind of thing.

That is not being done, notwithstanding the fact we have signed eight or nine forest management agreements with major licence holders across the north. Now the dialogue seems to be turning around and they are starting to talk about the recommendations that were contained in the Armson report in 1976. That is the basis for a turnaround of the years, the decades, of neglect of what should be considered a renewable and infinite resource of Ontario, as opposed to the neglect, the indifference, the way in which we have mined rather than managed our forests and treated them as an agricultural crop.

You will know this, Mr. Speaker, with your background in the area of the province you represent. If a farmer treated his farm in the way we treat an area of land that is dedicated to the growing of trees in Ontario, in the way we treat this most important resource—a renewable, infinite resource, if it were done properly—he would be out of business in five years. If he continued to take something out with no thought of ever putting anything back, if he harvested every fall and went away and neglected the farm, he would not have a farm for very long. But that is what we have been doing.

We could go back into history, dating back to when C. D. Howe used to be quite active in the forestry school of the University of Toronto in the mid-1920s, and see what he said about the need to treat the forest industry as a renewable resource. Members should read the recently released book by Dean Sisam of the forestry faculty of the University of Toronto. They should go back and read what Colonel Kennedy said in 1948, what a chap by the name of Brodie said in 1968, what the Ontario Economic Council said in 1969, what Hedlin-Menzies said in 1970 and what Armson said in 1976.

I would like every member of this Legislature to go with me to areas like Savant Lake and a good many others where I can show them they have clear-cut right down to the water's edge on lakes where literally hundreds of people rely on the wilderness, the fish and game resources, and all the things that tourists travelling to the north expect to see when they get there; I could show how this so-called multiple-use concept works with regard to the way we manage our forestry resources.

A lot of people in this assembly are not aware

of how important forestry is, not only to northern Ontario or Ontario as a whole but to the whole of Canada. I am sure a good many members, if they have been following the dialogue, will hear pronouncements made by the Honourable John Roberts, who is the Minister of the Environment and responsible for co-ordinating any activity of the federal government in forestry.

We talk about agriculture here on a daily basis. If one added up the economic impact in terms of export dollars, the balance of payments, of agriculture as well as mining and all of those activities where we earn foreign dollars and doubled them, one still would not match the economic impact our forest industries have on the Canadian and our provincial economy. Most people do not understand that.

If one talked to farmers, whether they are in mixed farming in southern Ontario, in beef farming, or in grain farming on the Prairies and put all of those forms of farming into the statistics, they would not come close to matching the economic impact that the harvesting of our forests can have and will continue to have on every living Canadian and on every Canadian yet unborn, if we were to play our cards right; but I see no evidence of that.

5:30 p.m.

I see this dialogue between the Minister of Natural Resources and the Minister of Northern Affairs. Those two people at least should be responsible for the sane and wise use, not only of our lands and waters—strategic land use planning and district land use planning—but of something that is so key, so pivotal to the future wellbeing of northern Ontario, Ontario as a whole and Canada as a nation. We have frittered away over the last 50 years an opportunity to be world leaders in forest management.

Let me get to some more particular aspects of forest management. Most members will recall we had an honest, sincere, dedicated and professional forester who, because he was interested in the kinds of things I have been trying to say over the last 15 or 20 minutes, was fired for his trouble.

What has happened in the interim? We had the Crown Employees Grievance Settlement Board that is responsible for looking into such matters. It recommended this honest, sincere, dedicated, youthful and professional forester should be penalized one week's wages for having acted in a different way. They said there was nothing wrong with what he did, but they found some minor fault with the way he did it.

That young, professional forester is now back on the payroll of the Ministry of Natural Resources and has been, except for that one-week period around April 1. He is being paid \$2,100 a month and they will not even let him inside the office. He is being paid \$2,100 a month to stay at home and not bother his district manager, his regional director or the Ministry of Natural Resources at all. They told him to stay away.

I know Mr. MacAlpine and how dedicated he is. He goes out on a regular basis in the unit he was responsible for and carries out on his own initiative silviculture treatment of the area that presumably he is being paid to manage, although he is not allowed to do it; but he goes out and he does it.

Since distance is a consideration, he asked his district manager, who will not let him inside the office, if they would consider paying him his time to commute back and forth in his own truck to the place where he has chosen to work to put something back for the \$2,100 he is getting. They will not even do that. He has written to the Minister of Natural Resources explaining his plight, his own particular circumstances, saying: "I am still a professional forester. I am still committed to managing the forests." The ministry will not allow him to do it.

Mr. Bradley: Is this Mr. MacAlpine?

Mr. Stokes: Yes. Why did he get fired? It was because he could not get the interest and the attention of his district manager. He could not get the interest of the regional director. He could not get the attention of the assistant deputy minister in Thunder Bay. He could not get the interest of the deputy minister in the Whitney Block or the minister himself. He made the mistake of telling me what was wrong. He said, "Give me time and give me the necessary resources to do an operational cruise on the area you want me to make recommendations about in terms of the inventory of timber, the age classes, the species and how we can allocate those timber values to maximize the benefit not only for local users but ultimately for the economy in Ontario."

He knew he was working with data, a forest resource inventory that was 20 years out of date. He said, "Let me do an up-to-date operational cruise, and whatever comes out of it I will make those recommendations and you can make the ultimate decision as to how you want to dispose of those timber values." I said: "Never mind that. Just give me a recommendation that there is sufficient timber to satisfy the traditional users."

We have 30 or 40 traditional users between Nipigon and Thunder Bay and we want to satisfy the needs of Buchanan Forest Products Ltd., which had just acquired a sawmill in Thunder Bay to add to the one it has at Hudson under the name of McKenzie Forest Products Inc., and the one Mr. Buchanan owns in Sapawe that he acquired two or three years ago from Domtar.

This is what he was attempting to do. They would not let him do it and they fired him for his trouble. Since then they realized they had to have that information, that data, before they could realistically allocate any of those timber values to traditional users or any additional users whom they had hoped to satisfy.

They put a tender out for the notice of professional foresters saying, "We require the services of professional foresters to do"—guess what?—"an operational cruise", on the area that was the responsibility of our friend Donald MacAlpine. He and another forester bid on it, because at that time he was without work. He was the lowest bidder and the most competent, but what did they do? They cancelled the contract.

That is not the end of it. They still had to have somebody do that. What did they do? They got a bunch of technicians, some forestry students from Lakehead University, and they said: "Go down there and do that inventory. Give us some data that we can reach some conclusions on."

About a month ago the Ministry of Natural Resources unveiled a 10-year operating plan for the Port Arthur crown management unit. Essentially they said, and I am quoting from memory, there were about one million cubic metres of wood on that crown management unit available for harvesting over the next 10 years. I attended the open house and I said: "Break this down for me. Tell me how many of those cubic metres of wood are on the Black Bay Peninsula." They said, "Just a minute now."

The forestry supervisor and a student put their heads together, got out their little pocket calculator and said, "Roughly about 195,000 cubic metres of wood are available on the Black Bay Peninsula over the next 10 years." I said, "That is about just under 20,000 cubic metres of wood a year to be divided between the traditional users and these others like MacMillan Bloedel and Buchanan Forest Products." They said, "Yes, that's it." So I said, "Fine, thank you very much," and asked them several other questions.

5:40 p.m.

When the traditional users went to look at the particular stands or plots that were allocated to

them under this 10-year operating plan, one of the stands was one that one of the traditional users had planted five years ago. Now we know in the boreal forest how long it takes to grow a tree. If one planted something five years ago and if one got a good catch, it would be about as high as this desk.

Another chap was quite happy. He had been allocated a 55-year-old stand of jack pine. They were about six to eight inches in diameter and there were a good many stems per acre and he could make a good living. He went, unloaded his bulldozer—there was still snow on the ground—and started pushing in a winter road to gain access to this area that had been allocated to him. He no sooner got the bulldozer off the flat-bed when they said: "No, no, we made a mistake. You cannot have this. You are going to have to look for another area." He asked, "Where is the other area?" I can see it out my window. In Nipigon, they have a cluster of trailers and right in the background there is a hill. He was told that if he went on top of this hill, that would be the alternative.

He cruised it that weekend. He thought that at best it would be eight or 10 cords to the acre. Of course, anyone who knows anything about harvesting of small-dimensional mixed stands in the north would know one cannot make his living on it, but he went in and had a look at it. Before he got a chance to even tell them that it was not economically feasible, they withdrew that from him.

This is a plan that is three weeks old, so what have we got? We have a reduction on the Black Bay Peninsula of 195,000 cubic metres of wood over the next 10 years, reduced by one quarter to 145,000 in just three weeks. We have one fellow who was asked to harvest an area that he had planted five years ago. We have another chap who was given two areas that have since been withdrawn and the only alternative offered was another one across the Canadian Pacific Railway tracks, and through a swamp in the middle of summer, so he does not have the resources to harvest it.

Now the ministry is saying, "Well, if we can stir up the money from Toronto, we will try to assist you in building a road so you can continue with your traditional livelihood of harvesting timber." What a hell of a way—if you will pardon the expression—to manage a resource.

When I started talking—I guess I have driven them all out—the member for Cochrane North was here, the member for Timiskaming was here and the member for Algoma-Manitoulin

was here. How do they feel about the way in which the Minister of Natural Resources, the member for Cochrane South, is administering the most important primary resource in Ontario?

This gets me to another thing. The members will all recall the furore that was created here just before Christmas over the fishery agreement. The Minister of Natural Resources said he had conferred and consulted with the Northern Ontario Tourist Outfitters Association, that he had consulted with the anglers and hunters across Ontario, that he had discussed it with a lot of people who he thought would be concerned about the ramifications of signing a tripartite agreement among the federal government, the provincial government and our native people in Ontario.

I happened to be at the cabinet meeting that was held over in the Whitney Block on that fateful day, when the public got to hear about this fishing agreement. The Minister of Natural Resources claimed he had undertaken realistic consultation with anybody he thought would be concerned, and the Minister of Northern Affairs almost denied any knowledge of the existence of an agreement.

I had never attended a cabinet meeting—and I do not think you have either, Mr. Speaker—but it would seem, if the Minister of Natural Resources had been charged with the responsibility of negotiating on behalf of Ontario with our first citizens and with the federal government, it would be with the knowledge and approval and endorsement of cabinet. One would think that would be a reasonable way to approach it.

I happen to know a cabinet committee met last August in Sault Ste. Marie where that very topic was discussed and where the Minister of Natural Resources was given approval in principle to enter into an agreement with the federal government and the native people. When the minister unveiled the plan, everybody denied any knowledge of it. They said the content of the plan may have some merit and be worthy of support, but the process surely left a lot to be desired.

One hears from time to time about two cabinet ministers having a mild difference of opinion. One may hear about the Minister of Health (Mr. Grossman) having a difference of opinion with the Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Drea), or the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry) having a mild difference of opinion with the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Elgie), as we

did hear in the last few days. We now hear, out of the mouth of the Minister of Northern Affairs, a very basic and fundamental philosophical approach to the way we should manage our resources.

We have a young Minister of Natural Resources, a little green, a little wet behind the ears, but trying to change things, trying to turn things around. Where are his cabinet colleagues when he needs them? One wonders when this government and its ministers are going to take seriously their responsibility to manage all our resources, whether they be finite resources like our mineral wealth, or infinite resources like trees if we play our cards right; and infinite resources also, again if we play our cards right, with regard to tourism, fast becoming the second largest industry in Ontario.

The people in southern Ontario think of tourism from their own perspective. If it is in Ottawa, the member for Ottawa East (Mr. Roy) knows what tourism means to our national capital and to the people who look on that as their livelihood. The member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Kerrio) can tell us what tourism means in his community and the people who depend on it for their livelihood.

Most members know what tourism in northern Ontario is all about. It costs a little bit more to get there; it takes a little more time; it takes a much greater commitment if you are going to go up there and enjoy what we have to offer by way of tourism in the north.

5:50 p.m.

But, generally speaking, if somebody is going to spend the number of dollars, the amount of time and the amount of energy to get up there to enjoy those resources, fight the mosquitoes and the blackfly and the sometimes inclement weather, it is going to be because he wants to hunt, he wants to fish, he wants to attack some wild river canoe route, he wants to rough it and get away from the rat race down here in southern Ontario. Well, if you want to fish, you have to find a lake with fish in it. If you are going to hunt, you are going to have to find some moose.

We have a program in Ontario called strategic planning for Ontario fisheries that has been in existence for five or six years. Under it there was an undertaking by the Minister of Natural Resources to begin to ensure that if we play our cards right there will be fishing from now until kingdom come to support our tourist industry.

If you go into a good many of those areas, and the member for Niagara Falls will tell members this, remote lakes where he once fished are

becoming badly depleted, particularly the prime species. In some areas it is pickerel; in other areas it is lake trout. We have even had to close down fishing in some of those lakes because of the inability of that resource to withstand the pressure on its own—sometimes from commercial fishing, sometimes from the ordinary angler like the member for Niagara Falls, but sometimes because of excess pressure as a result of tourist operations in the north, where we are attracting people in ever-increasing numbers, a lot of them from beyond our borders.

It does not matter whether you are talking about trees, about fish resources or about wildlife resources: you cannot continue just to take it out as if you have an endless amount of resources. If you want to continue to take it out, you must one day make the decision to start putting something back; and I wonder when the day will come when we will truly manage the resources.

The government can talk about their strategic land use plans, their district land use plans, their park plans—they can talk about all of those things; but unless there is a commitment to manage and husband the primary resources around which the economy in Ontario rotates, they will reach the day when it is no longer there and they will have to look for something else.

The government know what has happened with the world economic recession, the impact it has had on our big neighbour to the south, the United States, and they know the impact it has had particularly on our manufacturing sector here in southern Ontario. In order to have a manufacturing sector you must be competitive, you must have a marketable product and you must have a natural resource that you can turn into a manufactured end product that is available for sale at competitive prices, not only in our domestic but also in our foreign markets.

It is so basic, unless we want to be like Japan, where we would bring everything in from offshore, whether it be steel, coal, aluminum or petroleum products, all of those things they bring to their shoreline. They manufacture them into something that is saleable at competitive prices and ship it out to world markets.

We know what has happened to our automotive industry in Ontario and in North America generally because of our inability to compete. Part of it is because our expectations are far too high. We have been living high off the hog far too long. We have to get down to reality. If we do not manage the resources I have been talking about over the last 40 or 50 minutes, that is going

to be the end of the road for this province of opportunity.

I could go on at great length and talk about the closing of a town such as Nakina because of the announcement by Canadian National Railways that it is no longer going to operate out of Nakina. It is going to run through from Hornepayne over to Armstrong. That is primarily the responsibility of the federal government.

I could talk about Via Rail's cutback in passenger service in the north where we no longer have a daily passenger train on the north line, the transcontinental line of Canadian National Railways. The members will probably doubt this, but I can tell them there are communities such as Ferland, Mud River, Auden, Collins and Allan Water that no longer have daily passenger service. They have a little jitney that goes through in the middle of the night three times a week and they are supposed to use that because there is no road access.

There we are, in this year of our Lord, 1983, in the most affluent province in the richest country on the face of the earth, and we cannot even provide road or rail access for people who actually live in those communities and provide a service. If it were not for people living in those communities, we would not have anyone to maintain the line that joins east and west. They provide a very useful service.

We just ignore them. We say: "Well, if you take sick, you will have to wait two or three days until the next train comes along and you can get out to see a doctor. If you have a toothache, you will wait two or three days to get out to see a dentist." That is the way we treat people in Ontario.

It will be said that is primarily a federal responsibility. The federal government is respon-

sible for railroads and Via Rail, but surely there could be the co-operation that is necessary to provide for everybody in Ontario regardless of where they live.

We had a task force set up a year and a half ago to study the high cost of transportation and the high cost of consumer goods in the far north. That is in places like Fort Severn, Big Trout Lake, Fort Hope, Kasabonika, Wunnummin Lake, Kingfisher Lake and all those communities that are off the beaten path. There are no roads into them. We have a network of air strips, thank God, so they can get in, weather permitting, but the costs are unusually high.

We have a community in my riding where they pay \$6.17 for a gallon of gasoline. That is about \$1.40 a litre, as opposed to what I pay, 53 cents in my home town, and what I paid for it in Thunder Bay as recently as last Sunday, 21.9 cents a litre.

I have asked for a study. They have said: "No. We will just disregard that." We have had this task force studying the high cost of living and transportation in the north for a year and a half now. I have been told for the last two months it is still at the printers. This is the kind of thing that turns people off.

I could go on at considerable length, but I think I have gone on long enough to indicate that I am not too happy with the indifference, the neglect, the turning of the head on problems in the north. I do not think it is sufficient to have a one-liner in the budget saying, "My government will look at the problems of one-industry towns in the north." That is just not good enough.

The House recessed at 6 p.m.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, May 3, 1983

Oral questions

Drea, Hon. F., Minister of Community and Social Services:	
Senior citizens services , Mr. Rae, Ms. Copps.	400
Miller, Hon. F. S., Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics:	
Government advertising , Mr. Bradley, Mr. Cunningham, Mr. Foulds.	406
Norton, Hon. K. C., Minister of the Environment:	
Pollution control , Mr. Peterson, Mr. Charlton.	398
Proclamation of act , Mr. Charlton.	407
Walker, Hon. G. W., Minister of Industry and Trade:	
Sparton of Canada Ltd. , Mr. Rae, Mr. Sweeney.	403
Layoffs at Allen Industries Canada , Mr. Mackenzie, Ms. Copps.	405
Welch, Hon. R. S., Minister of Energy and Deputy Premier:	
Damage by tornadoes , Mr. Peterson, Mr. Rae.	397
Hydro rates , Mr. Kerrio, Mr. Foulds.	404

First readings

Small Claims Court Amendment Act , Bill 28, Mr. McMurtry, agreed to.	408
Estates Administration Amendment Act , Bill 29, Mr. McMurtry, agreed to.	408

Throne speech debate

Mr. Renwick.	410
Mr. Kennedy.	414
Mr. Wrye.	418
Mr. Andrewes.	424
Mr. Stokes.	427

Other business

Article in newspaper , Mr. Haggerty.	397
Article in newspaper , Mr. Gregory, Mr. Brandt, Mr. Breaugh.	408
Polish anniversary , Mr. Ruprecht.	409
Throne debate schedule , Mr. Gregory.	409
Notice of dissatisfaction , Acting Speaker.	417
Recess	433

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Andrewes, P. W. (Lincoln PC)
Boudria, D. (Prescott-Russell L)
Bradley, J. J. (St. Catharines L)
Brandt, A. S. (Sarnia PC)
Breaugh, M. J. (Oshawa NDP)
Charlton, B. A. (Hamilton Mountain NDP)
Conway, S. G. (Renfrew North L)
Copp, S. M. (Hamilton Centre L)
Cousens, D., Deputy Chairman and Acting Speaker (York Centre PC)
Cunningham, E. G. (Wentworth North L)
Drea, Hon. F., Minister of Community and Social Services (Scarborough Centre PC)
Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP)
Gregory, Hon. M. E. C., Minister without Portfolio (Mississauga East PC)
Haggerty, R. (Erie L)
Johnston, R. F. (Scarborough West NDP)
Kennedy, R. D. (Mississauga South PC)
Kerrio, V. G. (Niagara Falls L)
Laughren, F. (Nickel Belt NDP)
Mackenzie, R. W. (Hamilton East NDP)
McClellan, R. A. (Bellwoods NDP)
McMurtry, Hon. R. R., Attorney General (Eglinton PC)
Miller, Hon. F. S., Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics (Muskoka PC)
Norton, Hon. K. C., Minister of the Environment (Kingston and the Islands PC)
Peterson, D. R. (London Centre L)
Rae, R. K. (York South NDP)
Renwick, J. A. (Riverdale NDP)
Robinson, A. M., Acting Speaker (Scarborough-Ellesmere PC)
Roy, A. J. (Ottawa East L)
Ruprecht, T. (Parkdale L)
Stokes, J. E. (Lake Nipigon NDP)
Swart, M. L. (Welland-Thorold NDP)
Sweeney, J. (Kitchener-Wilmot L)
Turner, Hon. J. M., Speaker (Peterborough PC)
Walker, Hon. G. W., Minister of Industry and Trade (London South PC)
Welch, Hon. R. S., Minister of Energy and Deputy Premier (Brock PC)



Hansard

Official Report of Debates

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Third Session, 32nd Parliament

Tuesday, May 3, 1983

Evening Sitting

Speaker: Honourable John M. Turner

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

Contents of the proceedings reported in this issue of Hansard appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of the speakers taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is \$15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, Information Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 965-2238.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Tuesday, May 3, 1983

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE (continued)

Resuming the debate on the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

Mr. Bradley: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, for the opportunity to address the House this evening on what I am afraid will be a very limited basis. I was looking forward to a two-hour oration with the galleries as full as they are. Actually, they are unusually full this evening; I think the whip of the Liberal Party indicated to the population that there would be some good speakers tonight, later on in the evening at least.

I did want to offer to the House a few remarks about the speech from the throne, particularly as those remarks would relate to the problems that confront my constituency but also touching on some with a province-wide implication.

Any representative who sat in the Ontario Legislature representing the provincial constituency of St. Catharines would be remiss if he did not mention the unemployment problem that has confronted not just our community but also the surrounding communities in the Niagara Peninsula.

At one place this winter—I believe it was in the month of January—the St. Catharines-Niagara region, as it is known for statistical purposes, recorded an unemployment rate of almost 22 per cent. It was exactly 21.7 per cent, which placed it the highest, not only in our province but also in our country, in those centres that are surveyed.

Needless to say, those of us who are political representatives in the area, regardless of our affiliation or whether we are provincial, federal or municipal members, are expressing a genuine concern about this and advocating some useful programs on the part of government to assist in the bouncing back of our economy to what it was in previous days.

Mr. Speaker, I believe your constituency is around the other end of the horseshoe. We are referred to as the Golden Horseshoe, and at one

time that was probably a valid designation for the area from Niagara Falls around to just past Oshawa.

The Deputy Speaker: I just want to bring my understanding to your attention, if the table would correct me. My understanding is that at six hours and 10 minutes the Liberal Party time has expired. Are you aware of that?

Mr. Bradley: Yes, thank you, I will watch the new digital clock. I have not found it an affront, by the way, to have a digital clock in here. I notice the lighting of the numbers has been toned down somewhat, and that should make even the member for Sudbury (Mr. Gordon) accept this innovation, which is of use to all of us in this chamber.

But back to the problem of unemployment. In our area it has been chronic unemployment. We have had a situation where we were up to 22 per cent this winter. We have been very high compared to other communities, but it is not a new problem. It is one that has been with us for a few years now and it is not simply related to the automotive industry, although we recognize that when there is a downturn in the automotive industry in any of those areas in which the automotive industry is a large industrial component, then we have circumstances where the spinoff in an adverse way is certainly quite pronounced.

In our community we have fortunately had an effort that is involving a number of segments of that community to confront the problems of unemployment. Those of us who are in the legislative chambers are advocating certain measures that I will deal with briefly in a few minutes.

We have also had the unemployed themselves attempt to form an organization that is constructively doing something about the problem. It is called the Unemployed Action Alliance. Mr. Allan Cronkwright, who has certainly not had political experience in the past or been associated with any protest groups or anything like that, took it upon himself to assume the presidency upon being elected at a meeting, along with David Young, who is the vice-president and working in conjunction with the president

of the St. Catharines and District Labour Council, Mr. Len Harrison, and the president of the United Auto Workers, Mr. Gerry Michaud.

Those are all people with the community at large in mind, as opposed to simply those they represent, who got together to provide some direct assistance to the unemployed by counselling them on their rights as they relate to receiving assistance from the government and by establishing a drop-in centre, which is now located at 145 King Street in St. Catharines, where people can obtain that kind of advice, share their problems with others and receive some counselling on other matters of a moral or ethical nature when they are experiencing problems that are confronted by those who face unemployment.

I must continue by saying that it is not the community alone or the people themselves alone who can benefit from action that is taken. The government and its revenues can also benefit from this action. I have advocated several measures that would be of assistance to those of us in the Niagara Peninsula as possible for review and implementation by the government. Some of those suggestions, of course, relate to alleviating the burden on those who have been directly hit by unemployment.

As you would be aware, Mr. Speaker, many regions across this province have had welfare bills that have been very high indeed. Of course, we recognize that 20 per cent of the cost of welfare is assumed by the local ratepayer in the property tax burden, that being the main and only significant source of revenue for municipalities. They are being hit with what I call a double whammy when the government of Ontario refuses to take a more interventionist role in assisting these municipalities.

Let us take the Niagara region, for instance, where there is almost 22 per cent unemployment. Many people are off their unemployment insurance benefits and many have had to go on welfare or accept some other kind of assistance that might be available from the government; so there is an impact on the local municipality. That municipality then faces a Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Mr. Bennett) and a Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) who both are advocating restraint because of the inflation problem that is confronting the Ontario government, the lack of revenues and the deficit, which is increasing. These people then are forced to go back to the local ratepayers, many of whom have lost their jobs, to extract more funds to pay for the cost of welfare.

For a person who has been unemployed for six or seven months the tax bill at the municipal level does not change. That person still has to pay \$1,100, \$1,200 or whatever the assessed cost is based on the mill rate that is struck by the municipality. That, of course, is the unfairness of the municipal property tax: it does not take into account a person's ability to pay.

On the other hand, those same individuals do not have to pay as much in income tax, because income tax is related to the amount of money a person is making; so it seems sensible that the more progressive taxes should be used to alleviate the burden on the local people.

8:10 p.m.

The Treasurer has accepted some of the suggestions that we in the opposition have put forward for stimulating the economy but certainly not all of them. We have mentioned that a number of projects are already on the books. We are not asking that people go out and look for useless projects that are going to be a burden on a municipality in years to come. We are looking for projects that are on the books of the provincial government. We would like the government to advance the schedules for some of those projects. In some cases, that has been done. I commend those who are responsible when that has been done.

In addition, some municipalities have undertaken the same type of program and that is beneficial. Generally speaking, what we need to assist communities such as mine and all the communities in Ontario is a budget that stimulates the economy, not one that retrenches or restrains expenditures at a time when unemployment is substantially high. This does not mean those of us in the opposition are advocating that the government squander millions of dollars on useless projects, but it does mean we are understanding when the provincial deficit increases.

It is the prerogative of the opposition to point out that there is a deficit or that it is increasing, but one would find far less criticism of a provincial deficit that has increased, but not substantially, at a time of high unemployment than one would if the economy were booming and there were no excuse for it. The Treasurer need not fear that those of us in the opposition would be overly critical of a budget that entertained increased expenditures and perhaps revenues that are not going to grow sufficiently to bring the deficit down and may result in an increase in the deficit.

We are looking generally for a stimulative

budget. We saw a little of that in the federal budget. Some of those measures will be helpful to the economy, more of them in the long term than the short term. We are looking for even more of an impetus from the provincial government in stimulating our manufacturing and other sectors in this province.

Mr. Conway: Has the Chairman of Management Board (Mr. McCague) given an undertaking?

Mr. Bradley: I notice nods of approval from the two ministers across the way, who recognize the wisdom of what I am advocating. I certainly commend these measures to them to take back to their cabinet colleagues.

I also want to look at the expenditures of this government, because in certain areas, for instance, hospital and health care spending, education and where we think it could be most productive, we have advocated and we are quite pleased to see the government playing its significant role. There are, however, areas where the government could cut spending and free funds for other areas. Some of them are obvious.

I think I strike a responsive chord in many of the members on the government side when I mention the ill-considered expenditure on Suncor, the \$650 million spent on shares of Suncor. Of 70 members across the way, I am sure I could find 64 members who could give me 64 better places to spend that \$650 million than on shares for Suncor, a corporation that is not going to be of direct benefit to Ontario simply by the expenditure of that money on shares that do not produce any jobs that Suncor would not have produced in any event without the government component.

I hear certain people on the other side stand and extol the virtues of Suncor, pointing out, "Do you realize in Renfrew, Ottawa East, St. Catharines and so on, all the jobs that are created?" We recognize those orders were placed before the government had any direct stake in Suncor. We see that as a wasteful expenditure of money which could be channelled in better directions.

I touched on the advertising budget this afternoon with the Treasurer. There are some programs—for instance, the compulsory immunization program—which must be brought to the attention of the public. I commend the government when it undertakes that kind of information campaign so people know what is required and why.

That kind of expenditure should be commended by the opposition, but not some of the advocacy advertising that goes on such as the extolling of

the virtues, indirectly or directly, of the Ontario government using the taxpayers' money, as we saw particularly in advance of the 1981 election when we heard: "Life is good, Ontario. Preserve it. Conserve it."

We heard that the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Norton) was pleased with the environment. I recall raising in the House the matter of \$20,000 being thrown into the Globe and Mail on five big advertisements when only about one of them had any hard content. I advise the Treasurer to cut his advertising budget by two thirds and free those funds for other areas or to give the hard-pressed taxpayer a break.

We have heard Minaki Lodge bandied about in this Legislature. Those of us who are critical of it, of course, are said to be opposed to northern Ontario or something of that nature. What we are opposed to is throwing all kinds of taxpayers' money, in this case \$45 million, into this one project, which is going to benefit essentially those in the upper middle and upper classes who are staying at the lodge.

That money could have been used more productively. I am sure the member for Sudbury would agree in his own mind—I do not expect he is going to interject that he does—that money could have been better spent in the Sudbury basin to alleviate some of the problems there.

I also think of the land banking schemes that have been undertaken in this province. What I want to say, without getting into a lot of detail, is that there are areas where this government can cut its spending and channel the money in other directions.

As a member from the Niagara Peninsula, I also want to take the opportunity to express my concern, as many of us have in the peninsula over the years, about the state of the Niagara River and, most particularly, the poisons that are going into the Niagara River from both sides but predominantly from the American side.

Mr. Conway: Do you drink bottled water?

Mr. Bradley: I certainly do not drink bottled water. I drink, believe it or not, the water that comes out of the Welland Canal.

I am prepared to tell the House some of the signs that are placed in public lavatories in Welland indicating why it is important to flush the facilities, but I do not want to get into the details of that. I notice we have guests in the galleries who might not appreciate it. But it is indicated in Welland and in Port Colborne that flushing should take place because St. Catharines needs the water. It does, indeed, make its

way down through Lake Gibson and into our drinking water. It is suitably sterilized, I guess.

Mr. Conway: If real men should not and do not eat quiche, can Premiers drink bottled water?

Mr. Bradley: A question which is probably relevant in some way to my remarks.

When am I cut off, by the way, Mr. Speaker?

The Deputy Speaker: You still have 12 minutes.

Mr. Bradley: I still have 12 minutes. Good.

I want to express my great concern about the Niagara River and not just about the dioxin. We focus our attention on dioxin because it is a catchword. It is the most dangerous chemical, we are told, and the media people are interested in that. They listen carefully when we talk about dioxin.

Let me tell members that the concern of those who are aware of the problem in the Niagara Peninsula revolves around the cocktail of harmful chemicals that is seeping its way into the Niagara River and eventually into the drinking water of the people of the Niagara region.

We are also concerned about such things as the Love Canal and the other dumps on the American side, chemical dumps where seepage is obviously taking place. We are concerned about the infamous Niagara Falls, New York, pollution abatement plant—and that is probably a poor word for it—where many of these chemicals are filtered through. That plant has never worked properly, as long as I can ever recall, in the Niagara region.

What we in the opposition are suggesting is that, because of this difficult circumstance, because of this alarming situation, the government of Ontario should fund as a pilot project—my colleague the member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Kerrio) has advocated this on many occasions—an activated carbon filtration system, which would allow the people in Niagara Falls and the surrounding area who are served by that plant to be a little easier in their own minds as to what they are drinking.

If the minister were prepared to stand up in this House and make that announcement, we would applaud him. We would also applaud if he were to fund around the Niagara region, where we have had other problems with these chemicals, the implementation of the activated carbon filtration system, or a system of equal value in terms of its technical value but of less cost, as has been discussed by the chief engi-

neer, Mr. Con Eidt, in the Niagara region. We are looking for that kind of activity.

8:20 p.m.

We also look for another kind of activity. If we are to be critical of the Americans—and let members make no mistake about it, there is a lot of room for criticism of what is taking place on the New York state side—it seems to me to be essential that we must make every effort to clean up our side.

We have two sewage treatment plants, one in Niagara Falls and one in Fort Erie, which are at the primary stage only. If we were to have a commitment on the part of the federal government with its assistance and that of the provincial government and the municipal government to implement at least secondary sewage treatment and, if possible, tertiary sewage treatment at those two plants, we would once again be demonstrating to our American friends that we are prepared to be an action group as well as a group that is prepared to talk about the problem.

If we are also prepared to be diligent in looking after the liquid industrial waste in our part of the province, this places yet another ace in the deck, another ace we can play.

The only way we are going to get the Americans to move, unfortunately—they are good friends of ours, and there are many on the other side who are just as concerned—is to embarrass them into moving by showing what a good job we can do on our side and what a bad job they are doing on their side in cleaning up this problem. That can work, particularly if we can interest the American news media at the national level.

We recognize that the American president does not have the same commitments as other presidents have had, but we recognize as well that there is a Congress there with people with consciences in it and that there are people who represent that local area who are willing to take this kind of action. Indeed, it has been Marguerita Howe in Niagara-on-the-Lake of Operation Clean Niagara who has led this fight, not any of us who are the politicians. We have been prepared to play our role as well in supporting her, and I hope the various levels of government will support her group and others who are fighting to clean up that part of the environment.

My time is limited, at least in this speech, but I want to deal also with the problem of looking at the Speaker's gallery, where no television cameras now sit. Members of the New Democratic Party, members of the Liberal Party and, I suggest, some members of the governing party

recognize the wisdom and importance of having an electronic Hansard in this House.

Yes, it has worked to the advantage of the government for 40 years not to have the people of Ontario know what is going on. There may be some on that side who would still like it to be that way. But I suggest that there are some fair-minded people over there who recognize the need to allow access to our main legislative body in Ontario—I call it the main legislative body; the place in Ottawa is second-place and this is first-place as far as I am concerned—for an electronic Hansard.

With an electronic Hansard, the people of Ontario could see the wonderful answers that are provided, for instance, by the Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Mrs. Birch), who sits here this evening, and they could see the scintillating questions that are put by the member for Ottawa East (Mr. Roy), by the member for Welland-Thorold (Mr. Swart) or, once in a while, by the member for Sudbury when he has an issue of great importance.

I am sure CKSO-TV in Sudbury, if that is still in existence, would like to be able to have access to the electronic Hansard so it could show the speeches that are made so eloquently on the nationalization of Inco by the member for Sudbury East (Mr. Martel). At present it cannot do that.

Let me remind members of the reason we do not have television on a continuous basis in this House: those who are in control on the government side deem it to be in their own vested interest to keep television out. We think there is a new order coming in Ontario and that members such as the member for Brantford (Mr. Gillies) must be pressing for an electronic Hansard, for access by the people of this province to what is going on at Queen's Park.

One of the best examples I remember was a conflict of interest allegation made in Ottawa. I turned on the six o'clock news on the Canadian Broadcasting Corp., and what did they have but a live vote from the House of Commons on it. Each member was standing and bowing, and the table officers could even remember all the members' names, believe it or not, in that particular case, as I am sure they do here. The Clerk always remembers, but some of the others sometimes have difficulty with names in this House. It is understandable. I will not mention names, but some remember better than others. Anyway, I am being distracted.

What happened was that while that was going on, we in this House had questions directed to

the government about what we in the opposition saw as a possible conflict of interest. There was no coverage on television, little if any coverage on radio and a little in the print media.

I am not suggesting they are not doing their job. I am suggesting that if there were an electronic Hansard here and if there were direct access to this House, in that case it would be more likely that kind of story would be picked up, played and judgements made. We do not have that kind of continuous coverage of what is going on in the House. That would be very important.

Mr. Hennessy: The comedy hour.

Mr. Bradley: The member for northern Ontario—

An hon. member: The former Liberal.

Mr. Hennessy: Don't do me any favours.

Mr. Bradley: The member for Fort William (Mr. Hennessy), who almost ran for the Liberals and who almost singlehandedly on that side sunk the jet, or I guess one shoots down a jet, voted for my resolution, for which I commend him. He would be among those who would advocate televising the proceedings of this House, because he would want the act of all us, and I take equal responsibility, cleaned up for the public at large.

I am sure this would at least moderate some of the interventions each of us makes in this House, myself included.

Mr. Roy: And the Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Drea).

Mr. Bradley: The Minister of Community and Social Services, bombastic as he is, might even tone down some of his interventions in the House with the television cameras looking at him, although with his character somehow I do not know whether we could ever tone him down. Perhaps we do not want to tone down the Minister of Community and Social Services. I hope the members over there, including you, Mr. Speaker, will agree we should have television in this House.

At the conclusion of my remarks, with about two minutes left, I want to say that what we in this party and the New Democratic Party have advocated, the New Democratic Party since 1978 and we since about 1972 under the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk (Mr. Nixon) as leader, is the striking of a select committee on education to deal with a number of education issues. As Education critic for this party, I think it would be of great advantage, not only to us but also to some of the members I see up there who

have a particular interest in education, to be able to review some of the trends in education before we actually get into them.

We all got hit with the computer education announcement. It was not even made in the House; it was made at a press conference. We all have to digest it to determine whether it is useful. It would have been of great advantage for those of us interested in education to have direct access to those who have an intimate knowledge of this.

The secondary education review project report became the Response on Secondary Education report, which is now OSIS, Ontario Schools Intermediate/Secondary. Would it not be nice for those who have a particular interest in education to be able to sit down in a select committee, in a relatively nonpartisan atmosphere, and listen to the representations made by those who are in the front line and who must implement that kind of report?

There is the whole issue of funding, the issues surrounding Bill 127 and Bill 100, the issue as to whether there should be increased discipline or less discipline in education. What I am pointing out is there are so many issues that are close to the people in this province it would be a great advantage to have a select committee on education to deal exclusively with them; not a group that is going to have members floating in and out who are just assigned to a committee because that is their job for the day, but people who are committed on a long-term basis to listen to education issues.

In conclusion, I urge the government to look at all the suggestions we in the opposition are making and to implement them on a progressive basis. The government will find that, instead of being the critical cranks it thinks we are, we will be standing in applause at its generous offerings.

8:30 p.m.

Mr. Mackenzie: Mr. Speaker, while it is always a pleasure to speak and say a few words in this House, it is not a particular pleasure or happy time to have to address the speech from the throne that was brought down a couple of weeks ago. Given the economic circumstances we are facing in the province, I have difficulty in understanding the lack of real initiatives when I know that currently in Ontario we have some 230,000 unemployed.

The Deputy Speaker: I just want to point out that we are now counting down, as opposed to what happened with the Liberals, which was counting up. The member has 43 minutes and 12

seconds left. I wanted to point that out so that it would not be confusing.

Mr. Mackenzie: I have difficulty in understanding why there were not more positive and direct measures in the throne speech dealing with the fact that we currently have 230,000 women and 233,000 young people out of work in Ontario.

I do not know how directly any of the members are involved in this, but I see it with my own family at home in their efforts to go to university. There are four of them trying to handle university and also find jobs and they are having a difficult time doing it. It is not easy for them and it is not particularly easy for the parents who are watching their efforts to make their own way in this world of ours.

When one takes a look at 782,000 people in Ontario out of work, the total unemployment in the province as of the last Statistics Canada figures, it certainly says to me that our problem in this province is providing jobs for people. We are not providing those jobs. We are not even setting the climate for those jobs.

We have a cry that comes constantly from the government benches for more investment, and I know it is a position basically supported by the Liberals. They do not care whether it is local, offshore or foreign investment. They say it is what we need to start to stimulate the economy and start to create jobs in Ontario. I do not have any difficulty with offshore or foreign investment if we have some control over it, but this government has never seen fit to set any guidelines or any rules. That is why we do not have content legislation in this country. That is why we do not have specific requirements before one is allowed to set up a branch plant.

We have become a branch plant economy in Ontario. We do not have specific requirements that say they have to do so much research and development if they are going to operate, that they have to do more than just use whatever incentives they have been able to get out of government to set up that branch plant, and that they also have to have the right to bid on overseas markets. I am amazed at the number of companies, branch plants in Ontario, that are really restricted from bidding on overseas markets. That is the prerogative of the head office. The branch plant was set up specifically to handle an operation and supply a need here in Ontario.

I do not happen to think the kind of deficit we are running into in financial terms—I am talking about interest, principal, dividends, royalties,

management fees, you name it, which is in the billions in this country—is a particularly healthy situation. I do not think the kind of deficit we are accumulating as a result of relying on a branch plant economy in Ontario is going to benefit us in the long run.

I think we have to start getting tough in terms of what we suggest is an obligation on these firms before they are allowed to operate in this province. I do not think we should tell them how to run their business, but what kind of corporate behaviour and what kind of responsibility we expect in terms of Canadian workers and in terms of the financial situation in this province that we are going to run into.

I find it difficult to deal with a company such as Consolidated-Bathurst, as we did the other day. When we are dealing with Consolidated-Bathurst, the words that are being used, the buzzwords such as corporate rationalization, are what we are getting from almost every single plant that decides to close down.

To sit there with Mr. Stangeland, the president of that company, as a number of us did, including the Minister of Labour (Mr. Ramsay) of this province—and I know they were a little embarrassed—and be told by this company it would not even consider meeting with the employees to look at an offer of purchase, and they had done a fair amount of work on it at that particular plant, after the company had clearly said they thought this plant was no longer a real viable operation. But not even to sit down, let alone consider an offer of purchase by the workers, to me raised serious questions.

The questions were raised because of his entire statement. What was it? First, they would not consider sitting down to discuss selling this plant to the workers, based on the fact that a good chunk of the market was a local Hamilton-area market for that particular plant, because it would be competition and nobody in the corporate sector is going to accept that kind of competition. As the president himself said to us at that meeting, "You would not allow Texaco to take over a key corner location, or Imperial Oil would not sell it to Texaco."

I always thought, in the context that I hear it from my friends across the way, that competition was the basic principle of the free enterprise and private enterprise system. But he made it very clear that they would not consider it because it would be competition and they were not about to accept that.

He also made it clear to us, and I think his actual statement was: "We have an obligation

and a right to move our order books around. We have a right to move our operations and plants around."

When I asked him, in a bit of anger—it was one of the few times at the meeting that it got a little bit heated—if he did not also think he had an obligation to the 160-odd workers in that plant, who averaged better than 24 years' seniority and which by the company's own admission was a pretty skilled work force, he very brusquely pushed aside the objections I made—and incidentally that were made by the Minister of Labour, my colleague the member for Hamilton Centre (Ms. Copps), the regional chairman and the mayor of Hamilton, who were quite upset—by saying, "We have met every requirement of the collective agreement or that is required in law in terms of severance pay."

We then pushed him as to whether he would consider special consideration for those workers in one of the other three plants that are now putting on a third shift in Ontario. He said no, they would not. They would recognize that they had been employees of Consolidated-Bathurst but there would be no special consideration.

To get off the hook, the Minister of Industry and Trade (Mr. Walker) said that while he was not happy with the situation and the way they had done it, the only criticism he made was of the way Consolidated-Bathurst had actually handled the plant closure. Mr. Stangeland did say he wanted to make it positive. He wanted to talk about Reid Dominion Packaging, the plant next door, which had actually purchased the Consolidated-Bathurst plant. We did not know it until that moment.

Because that plant might employ 75 to 100 workers, we asked if he would then consider interceding with this other plant on behalf of his employees in the course of the finalization of the sale. He said: "No, we really would not appreciate it if, in the course of trying to sell an operation, somebody were to dictate to us who we should hire. They have to go to the marketplace for employees just as we do." That is when it was crystal clear that in the final analysis those workers were nothing but a marketplace commodity to that corporation.

I have gone into a little detail in this case because what has happened there is really what is happening in almost every one of the closures that have hit us—the six in Hamilton—in the last few weeks. I suggest they are symptomatic of what is happening across Ontario.

We have the issue we raised today of Allen Industries in Hamilton. They produce a fibre

material used under the hoods of automobiles and a number of other spots on the dash in the cars. They have been slowly cutting back on the production of that material. The company is now telling us, and we could have deduced it ourselves, that actually there are some new products coming on the market that are going to replace the need for all of this fibre matting that is used in automobile production.

Once again, this is a branch plant that is making decisions outside of Canada. Did we get consideration for that product, or for as long as we are going to carry the current fibre matting material? No, we will need this material manufactured for a couple of years but it is apparently going down to a plant in Virginia. They are now setting up a plant in Illinois to produce the new replacement material. Once again, 200 workers in the Stoney Creek plant are out of work and we are going to be importing what we used to manufacture.

8:40 p.m.

Mr. Munro, the federal Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, made it clear that the company had not talked at all to the federal authorities about any assistance or any chance of doing something about this as near as I can tell, except they are now involved in an industry and labour adjustment program discussion as related by the Minister of Industry and Trade in this House today; nor have we been involved in any serious discussions with this company.

The result is that by a corporate decision outside of this province we have 200 workers down the tube. We are now going to be importing that product. We were not even considered in terms of the replacement product for a variety of reasons, most of which involve corporate rationalization. That is going to help the company, just as the closure is going to help Consolidated-Bathurst in the closure of the plant in Hamilton.

We have the same thing going on to a lesser extent in True Temper Canada Ltd. and the same situation in H. and R. Johnson (Canada) Inc., which makes ceramic tile in Hamilton. They have a good, productive work force in that plant with some pride in their skills. They have now reached a situation where for the last couple of years most of the clay has been coming in from England, from the head office of the company. They have also slowly been bringing in and taking a look at some of the tiles from Italy and Spain. The company has now made a decision—and it also called it corporate

rationalization—to shut down the Hamilton plant. Once again, 40 or 50 long-service workers are out of work. We are going to import the tiles from Italy, Spain and the head office in England. It is the same effect.

The Deputy Speaker: Order. We seem to have an unusual sharpness of other people speaking. I find it distracting.

Mr. Mackenzie: It is not unusual.

In the H. and R. Johnson case we have another example of where we are going to be totally importing the product we manufacture.

I got a bit of a laugh out of the shenanigans of our federal member Mr. Munro, who is the federal side of my riding. He has jumped in on every single one of these closures to date. He made a lot of noise in the H. and R. Johnson case and what he was going to do about it, but he has not produced one job or one plant remaining there or one new contract.

Indeed, for about the third day in a row he made a major story in the local press over the fact that he had worked out with Mohawk College a special six-week training program for the workers at H. and R. Johnson so they could upgrade their skills in installing ceramic tiles. Let me tell the House that I suspect most of that would have been worked out in the normal course as the people took advantage of the skills they had and as we try to put people into retraining programs.

I could change these plants to other plants across Ontario, but because I have been very closely involved in these particular operations in the last little while I want to use Flavorite Poultry Ltd. as an example also. It is only a year and a half ago that the United Co-operatives of Ontario purchased the plant. It had been modernized. It was supposedly capable of doing the entire small broiler chicken operation for that company in Ontario. They predicted great things for the Flavorite poultry plant.

One and a half years later the plant is sold. Once again, the minimum notice was given as far as the workers are concerned. We are told the operation is going to move to the Petersburg plant near Kitchener, which has the capacity not only to do the larger birds and turkeys, but also all of the small broiler chickens, and there is no future for the other plant and the 100 workers. In addition, there was a quota attached to that plant when they bought it. I am bloody well convinced that was the reason they did purchase the plant. That quota now goes with it to the plant at Petersburg.

Rationalization is a funny game in the way it is

rolling over in Ontario. Not only did they close down that plant with the idea of moving the quota and the production to Petersburg, but only two weeks later we find that Maple Leaf Mills has bought the entire poultry operation from United Co-operatives, including the hatcheries.

When the workers asked, because they are just winding up their employment at the plant, they were told they have no intention of opening up the Flavorite plant. They had bought the package with the plant closed. They got the plant. What they will do with it I do not know, but they had bought it on that basis. It is pretty obvious there were some nice little negotiations going on in that situation and that it was closed deliberately by United Co-operatives to assist the sale to Maple Leaf Mills. Once again, though, in a corporate rationalization which is probably going to be better for Maple Leaf Mills in terms of their efficiency and their operation, there is no consideration beyond the basic consideration for the 100 employees who were in that plant.

I have mentioned just a few plants in my area. The fact is that this is going on generally and the question that has to be asked is when that is happening to the workers—and I suggest to the community in a very major way as well because of the costs that are involved—considering the effect on the workers if a company is able to rationalize to make its operation leaner, more efficient, more able to survive, when is part of the cost of that rationalization going to be more serious responsibility for the workers who are involved and for the community?

Do they not count, or are they strictly a marketable commodity? That sure shows this is the attitude we are taking; the total superiority, if you like, in terms of this government's thinking, of the capital side of the equation. They can say what they like; it is not the workers that count.

I want to go a little further. I want to mention what is happening in a number of other operations. Economically I do understand them to some extent, but once again I am asking, when do workers start counting in Ontario?

We are meeting this coming week with the 45 women, almost entirely Portuguese, who were part of the cleaning staff over at the Eaton Centre. We are meeting with them and their parish priest. They have been talking to us. They have been really upset because they had worked hard to organize and to get a union. They had worked hard to get a contract and in

getting that contract they were told that they had better settle pretty cheaply or they were not going to be able to hang on to their jobs because somebody else would bid on the job.

I will probably get nailed for saying this, but they accepted what, even in the union's mind, was really a substandard contract. What happens? Two months later that contract is sold to another outfit in Toronto. When these women, most of whom have been working for a number of years in that cleaning operation, ask if there is something there that at least allows them to hang on to their jobs—because there is sure not going to be much more money involved—they are told no; they are out in the cold. I presume the wages that will be paid to the new group will probably be back where these women were before they started trying to organize. As I say, it was not a wage that would make any of us proud.

Or take the nursing home example used in this Legislature by my colleague the member for Scarborough West (Mr. R. F. Johnston), where we had eight of the women sitting in the gallery. I am pretty sure when we got a couple of rather crazy answers from the minister and some of the other interjections from the Tory side of the House they did not realize those were the women involved. They also had between eight and 14 years' seniority and the top wage among those women was \$7.05 an hour after 14 years in that operation. Most of them earned considerably less than that—they were down around the \$6 range in wages—and their contract was sold out.

We have a wide open free enterprise system in this province, in this country. Their contract was sold out when they made a desperate effort to hang on to their jobs. The company that bought out the contract finally said: "Okay, we will take you. But we will take you at \$4.50 an hour." "Will you take all of us?" "Well, as we need you."

Significantly, the eight women who sat in this gallery the other night had the longest service and were really the instigators of getting the union in there a year or two ago to begin with. What has happened? Five of them have not been called back for one day in the two months since this agreement was worked out. The people who had just come on, and had much less seniority, are working at \$4.50 an hour. Of those women, one of them had one and a half weeks, one had three days and one had two days that they were called in to work. They now understand the system a lot better.

When we talked to them after the session in the House, and there was an angry exchange between myself and some others and the Minister of Labour at the time, one of them said to me, and she was not an Anglo-Canadian: "Mr. Mackenzie, I could not understand what I was hearing in the House. I could not believe it." She also said, although it does not seem to bother the Tories: "I have voted Conservative since I have been able to vote in Canada. I won't do it again."

Unfortunately we are dealing with ones and twos. I wish we were dealing in this House in those kinds of situations in tens and twenties and thirties. But I am telling you, Mr. Speaker, and I am warning this government, that kind of message is getting across in Ontario, and the workers do not have very many benefits or very many rights.

8:50 p.m.

I want to go into another situation for just a moment. It is a tight and tough economy and one does not exercise one's rights in collective bargaining—the final right, the ultimate right, and that is the right to strike—very easily today. I know that the opinion of some of the more hard-hat members of this assembly is that workers are nuts and they go out at the drop of a hat. I have been involved with too many of them and servicing too many locals in my life to believe that, particularly with the situation as it is today.

I want members to know what happens when they finally do exercise that right. The case we have used in this House time and again in Central Precision Ltd. is a first-rate example of it, and just to drive the point home to some of the people who sit in this Legislature, somebody should take a look at that work force: 100-and-some employees, mostly Portuguese, some Italians, a handful of Anglos in that particular plant, with 11, 12, just short of 20 years of heavy labour in that plant.

They have gone through the mill. They had a very rough strike 11 years ago when they organized that plant. They were set upon literally by Grange and the Canadian Driver Pool Ltd., people with all of the strikebreaking tactics that are known, and they survived.

There had not been a strike since. But finally, 10 years later, the workers once again feel compelled—I will not say driven; it is a decision they made, but it was not an easy decision. Once again, if I can digress, I was surprised at the extent of the pride in their country, especially among the new Canadians in that plant. I was impressed by the sincerity and the number of

those who held pretty close and pretty fundamental religious convictions. We sensed it when we talked to some of the women on that picket line.

Finally they were forced into a strike. The day the strike starts, we have Securicor, this great outfit in Ontario, called in by the company. I do not know what the cost is, but I suspect it is thousands of dollars a week and I suspect the figure that was given to some of the employees on the picket line, whom we brought in and had tell the Minister of Labour personally what had been said to them, was accurate.

What do we get on that line? We get the company trying to hire the strikebreakers. In the universal language of people who have to go on strike, they are the scabs. We get them crossing the lines in vans. We get these vans driving up at 7 a.m. or 7:15. Maybe it would be a good idea if some of the Tories joined us out there this coming Friday morning, when a good number of our caucus and most of the leadership of the trade union movement in Ontario will be on that line.

But we get them coming in; we get the Securicor cars inside the plant, driving up to within a few feet of the picket line. The cameras start whirring, and then as the scabs go through we get the obscene gestures, the remarks, the "up yours" and all the rest of it from the people inside the cars. Is it any wonder why people who are on strike—and it is their job, they are trying to better themselves, they have made that decision consciously, they have worked there for a good many years—get uptight and excited?

When we get that kind of confrontation, I do not know when there is not the odd side of a car kicked and maybe occasionally a headlight that gets smashed. I make no bones about it; I think they lay it out on the table. It is a minority of them. But it is also because of the harassment, the intimidation and the anger that is built up at people going in and taking their jobs that this can happen.

We have one of the officials of that security company coming up on the picket line after one of the confrontations and saying to the secretary of the local and the two or three people who were walking with this young lady: "Keep it going as long as you want. We don't care if the odd car gets scratched. It is all on our bill. The longer you keep this place closed, the longer we are collecting \$20,000 a week." That is exactly what was said, and the people who heard it came in themselves to say it to the Minister of Labour.

That is the kind of intimidation and harassment we get.

Then we get Securicor—not the police, but the police being used in this province, I am sorry to say—one, two, three, four or five days later down at the local justice of the peace saying, “We have had a good deal of trouble with this gentleman,” swearing out arrest warrants for workers. We conveniently get the police arriving on that picket line two or three days later, right at the time the scabs are going to go into the plant, to serve those warrants, arrest those people and pull them down to the station.

Sometimes they are held overnight, as the first batch of four were, and go through all the processing and fingerprinting, one or two of which we know will be thrown out when we finally get to court because they were totally innocent. One or two are probably going to end up with—one case already has—a \$23 mischief fine. The charges were only mischief, but they hauled them in. Now 27 of those workers have been hauled in and they have conveniently picked the time. In one case, they arrested four of them almost two weeks after the charges had been laid with the justice of the peace.

What happens to those workers? I can tell members what is happening to them. I can tell members what happens to Joe Periera, when he found out. He did not even know there was a warrant for his arrest. He was the 27th person to be picked up. The local union president called him and said, “You had better come to the station,” and he went. He went with his family. The first thing they did in the station, for a mischief charge, was to put the handcuffs on him.

I have talked to some of the wives and families of those strikers and I want the members to know what they are saying to me. I want to put one more equation into it. After they have had the morning confrontation and things have settled down for an hour or two and the scabs are in the plant, one of the Securicor cars drives out and goes across the street where a police car is parked for a good chunk of the day.

They move up side by side, roll the windows down and trade cigarettes back and forth and have a little bit of a talk. The workers on the line watch that. They are saying to me, some in good English, some in broken English: “Mr. Mackenzie, how can this happen? Where is the justice? We have struck the company. We are fighting Securicor. We are now fighting the police. When we have gone down to lay charges the

same justice of the peace will not accept them. Where is the justice in Ontario?”

That is only one case, but unfortunately it happens in all too many cases. That one is just an outstanding one and an obscene case. Does the government not understand why workers in this province feel that way when they see the plant closures and no positive attempt is made to do something about that closure. When they see the decisions being made outside the province, does the government understand that they try to get whatever they have been able to gain in collective bargaining or the law allows?

Members know, I do not have to tell them. I do not have to dig up the figures here. We are now into the tens of thousands in plant shutdowns in Ontario. When one sees workers who do still exercise their rights and run into what one runs into on some of the picket lines, one can understand why these people were saying to me: “Where is the justice? How can this happen? This is Canada. I am a citizen. I am proud of this country. One of the reasons I came here was so we would not have this kind of thing happening.”

Most of the people in this Legislature and most in the public, if they are not directly involved in one of these confrontations, do not have an idea of what is happening and what is going on. My concern is not that these things are happening. If one has been in the trade union movement as long as I have, one gets to accept some of the confrontation and understands that it would be nice if we had another way and maybe we can look at it, but at the moment it is the last resort and the only real defence or argument workers have.

We cannot understand why we get sloughed off—that is the only word I can think of—so totally by this Minister of Labour and this government when we suggest legislation such as they have in two or three provinces to control or eliminate professional strikebreakers. I would go much further than that suggestion. Bill 12 that is filed in this House would go much further for the first time.

My bill is one that will do nothing more than control professional strikebreakers on a picket line situation, and for the seven and a half years I have been in this House the government has said, “No way.” It says, “No way,” in terms of the suggestions that we try to make in this House.

Neither the Tories nor the Liberals can get out of responsibility for this. Three years ago when the plant shutdown committee took a look at 13 plants, before we had the recent influx, the

big increased unemployment and a situation that has worsened, there was only one of them in Ontario, the Heintzman plant, that was not a classic, that did not fit the mould.

Most of them were making money, some not as much as they had made. Some of them were doing very well. All of them were closed by decisions of the head office outside of Ontario, outside of Canada. All of them were closed without any real consideration other than what they had gained, in most cases themselves, through collective bargaining of the workers. The cost to those workers and to their communities, I suggest, is a pretty substantial cost to the province.

We looked at them. We were surprised at the number of them not doing any real research and development. They were not trying to supply an offshore market, in some cases because they were not allowed. We tried to make a number of recommendations. Of course, members all know that the realities of March 19, 1981, which the Tories love to speak of, meant that committee has never been reconstituted and it never reported.

9 p.m.

We had one brief interim report on a few minor matters. I can recall well, with my colleagues on that committee, arguing and fighting and trying to convince the Tory and the Liberal committee members to agree to much earlier notification, to agree to a community adjustment fund and, probably most important of all, to agree to a public justification procedure. That might not stop what was happening, but it would at least require a corporation to go before a review board, to open up its books, to give its justification for the closure. It may very well be that we can make even more money by closing, regardless of what is happening here.

It would also allow some input from the workers in the particular plant and from the government, because it just might not be—never mind the workers—in the government's interest to see another several million dollars of imports coming into the province where we were currently producing. The Bendix plant in Windsor is a classic example of that. It might have made sense, certainly in the Consolidated-Bathurst case, if the company had had to give notice six months in advance of what it was going to do to that plant.

If the company had been required to go before a public justification procedure, the workers would have been alerted, and the package they pulled together with help from some other financiers, as well as a pile of their

own money they were ready to put into it, would at least have been a viable option that the company would have had to consider. If they are in private enterprise, why does the competition worry them, especially when it is coming from an old plant they do not really think is any good any more? I cannot understand that and I have not had a Tory in this House give me a clear explanation of why.

If we had had the public justification procedure, we would have bought some time. We would probably have forced that company, through the pressure of public opinion, if you like, at least to take a look at the workers' offer to operate the plant.

I want to make it clear I have a lot of sympathy with more worker control. I have no difficulties with crown corporations, with joint ventures or with private entrepreneurs, but I think there has to be some responsibility. If there was a better way, or another buyer for the plant, that would not bother me either. I am talking of the private market. On the other hand, I think if the workers decide that is the route they want to go and nobody else wants to purchase it, they should have that right.

With the public justification procedure, we would have bought some time. None of the Liberals would support that in the committee, as some of them will remember. That is one of the reasons I get a little ticked off when I hear John Munro talk about what we can do for workers. I tell him, "Darned little, my friend." I ask him, "Why are we in Ontario reduced to begging?"

As I have told most of these workers—and I was not happy doing it—that is exactly what we are doing when we are faced with an after-the-fact announcement of a closure of an operation that means hundreds of jobs. We are begging the company to stay open or to let us purchase it or for some help from the federal or provincial governments. We are literally begging. Why should we be?

There is only one answer at the moment. Barring a miraculous turnaround of the economy that takes care of everything and everybody involved, the only answer is by setting some rules or some legislation. Every time the press gets after the Minister of Labour after we have had a hassle in this House over the latest plant closure and the latest injustice to workers, he says he sympathizes every bit as much as we do. I grant him that.

I respect the fact that he personally feels strongly about it, but I wonder how long he is going to continue trying to resolve every one of

a hundred problems a week that are coming across his desk, rather than taking a look at what we could do with legislation that might reduce the number of problems we are facing, that might give some clout, some rights to workers in Ontario.

I also wonder why we do not have some kind of justification procedure, longer notice, some kind of community adjustment fund. Are these things so totally out of line? If they are, all I am asking the members opposite and the members on my right is that they give us some clear, workable alternatives that answer the problem, because they are not doing that.

Do not talk to me about the bills, do not talk to me about the industry and labour adjustment program or the temporary and minimum-wage jobs we are creating. When we are in trouble, no one knocks any jobs the government creates. But we are not taking a look at the basic structure of the branch plant economy we have in Ontario. Until we do and until we stop relying on being able to put up a few more branch plants that will close down when the parent office decides they are going to close down and that do not have any real commitment to this province, we are not going to solve our employment problem in Ontario.

We have to take a serious look at protecting some of the existing smoke-stack industries, as they are now called by some people, the basic industries where the jobs are in this province. It is not good enough to accept, as some members in this House seem to have done, that there is no future any more in any long-term period in the basic industrial structure of the province, that our future has to be in high-tech industries, chip technology and in moving into that new field.

There is no one in my party on the benches in this part of the House who will disagree and say we do not have to move into this field in a hurry and with some planning. What we do wonder, and I have to raise it in all seriousness, is how long it is going to take us to get into this high-tech industry. What kind of jobs are going to be there? Do we not realize every industrial country in the world, as well as the Third World, is trying desperately to get into that same field?

What makes us think we are going to be able to corner the market in that field? What are we going to do in the time it takes to get it moving and going in terms of the tens of thousands of workers we still have in traditional industrial plants in Ontario, and if we continue the bash-the-worker syndrome we seem to have going on to downgrade wages?

One of the things the government's Bill 179 has effectively done is exactly what it wanted. It may have been directed at only 14 or 15 per cent of the people, in the public sector, but it has had exactly that effect in the private sector and wage settlements are running at considerably less than six per cent. There was the industrialists' plea to the Premier (Mr. Davis) when they said: "Do not back off in terms of Bill 179, but make sure you do not impose it on the private sector because we can do better. If you impose it at nine and five, that is what we will have to pay." In fact, they are paying less in the settlements now coming across the bargaining table.

If we continue to depress wages, put 782,000 people out of work in Ontario and do not come up with the jobs and the programs to answer that problem, and if we do get lucky and move into and corner a bit of the market in terms of jobs in the high-tech industries, what are we going to be doing it at? Instead of the current, traditional heavy industry wages of \$10, \$11 or \$12 an hour, a little better in some cases and a little less in others, are we going to move into this new industry at \$6 and \$7 an hour?

We see a deliberate suppression of wages and benefits in this province—and I think it is deliberate; I do not think it is happening just as a result of what is going on. I think, and forgive my cynicism, that it is a deliberate attempt to do that kind of downgrading.

The argument used, of course, is we have to be more competitive in world markets. That is a lot of nonsense. We have to decide we are going to protect some of our industries. We have to decide that one of the ways we do it is probably through content legislation. We have to decide that where we can do something well, and we in this party in this House have all given examples, that is probably an area that is worthy of some subsidization.

We should keep a good chunk of the industrial jobs we currently have in Ontario and pick up whatever we can, both in the service sector, which has been the big growth sector until now and is also getting cut back because of restraint programs, and in our attempts to get into the high-tech area.

If the pundits are correct, we are faced with further mechanization and robotization of our industries and even of many of the service industries whether banks, offices, insurance companies, etc. If they are correct, one of the benefits of this high-tech industrial revolution that is going on is that we are going to be able to do even more with fewer people and we are

going to be able to program the entire assembly operation in a plant with a chip an inch square.

If that is true, and I happen to believe it is and the evidence is increasing that this is the case, where is the income going to be? I veritably believe we no longer have a basic problem with production in the western world. Our problem is consumption. Where is the money going to be for people to buy the goods we can produce? How are we going to do a redistribution?

That is another area. I am not going to take the trouble now to dig into the figures, but the facts are that the income of the top 10 per cent in this country is growing and has been growing steadily. In the bottom 40 per cent it has been shrinking. I am simply saying I have seen nothing in that throne speech, absolutely nothing, that speaks to any kind of income redistribution.

9:10 p.m.

It sure as blazes does not help the really low-income people. It sure as blazes is not going to help a heck of a lot of workers who all of a sudden find, because of the plant shutdowns and transfers, they are knocked back from their current, reasonably paid jobs, at \$10, \$11, \$12 per hour, to anywhere from minimum wage up to \$7 or \$8 per hour. I have talked to an awful lot of people who have had to make that kind of drop, 30 and 40 per cent in their wages, when they finally did find a new job.

If we are going to go into this Valhalla of tomorrow, this chip technology, are we going to go into it at a \$6 and \$7 wage level in this province, in this country? Where is the purchasing power going to be?

I suggest we in this House have not taken that question seriously enough. We really have not taken a serious look at it. Not only is there nothing in the throne speech to really protect jobs, there is nothing about any meaningful restructuring. There are a few million dollars for some short-term and minimum-wage jobs, and a few maybe at a little bit better than that, but no real restructuring of our economy, no effort to gain a little more control, no effort to come to grips with the branch plant economy from which we are suffering in this province, no effort to deal with income redistribution so that, if we can produce these miracles, people have the wherewithal to buy the goods we produce.

We have none of that. With 782,000 people in Ontario out of work, with 233,000 young people and 230,000 women, where in blazes is this government? Where in blazes is a positive,

hard-hitting, real program? With due respect, Mr. Speaker, it does not exist.

We see patchwork; we see no real effort to deal with the basic problems. We do not see this kind of program, and we do not hear much of an alternative from the Liberals. I simply have to say that we have not come to grips with our really serious problems in Ontario.

We could get into pensions. We could get into safety and health. I had intended to read a couple of memos, but do not have time now, unfortunately. One of them has to do with coke oven emissions—a favorite hobby-horse of mine—something which has resulted in an awful lot of workers dying from lung cancer. Even Weiler is now saying an awful lot of them never got the benefits they should have from the Workers' Compensation Board.

We have that kind of situation, and there are problems with the new regulations that we are now trying to resolve. Let me just read a paragraph out of this memo I just got, almost in desperation, from the union at Stelco. "Stelco will not agree that people who work in the coal-handling and byproducts plant should be covered by the new regulations. This particular operation covers better than 40 people. The company is using this section, subsection 3(1), to exclude workers in the coal-handling operation, some of whom are actually working in bunkers right over the coke ovens, and workers in the byproducts plant. Although in some operations the byproducts plant might be remote from the coke ovens, at Stelco it is only 50 or 60 feet away."

The memo goes on to point out they are actually getting the same kind of exposure as those who actually work on the coke ovens, and sections of the act are being used to deny them the coverage we are supposed to now have under one of the five. How many years has it taken us to get five designated substances?

I would like to have covered many more things, but all of those tell us that working people are not among the priorities in Ontario. I do not care whether it is jobs, whether it is health, whether it is their rights in a legal strike situation, or what it is.

I am also saying this government had better get off its can and start taking a look at the problems people have—women, youngsters, workers—which it is not doing at the current time.

Mr. Gillies: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join in this, I believe the third throne speech debate I have taken part in since I was elected some two

years ago. As I recall, I am sure that in both those first two debates I focused my remarks on matters of an economic nature—questions of jobs in industry and so on. I will be doing so in this one, and I suspect in throne speech debates to come I again will be talking about matters of an economic nature.

I would like to pick up on a few of the themes that were being developed by the member for Hamilton East (Mr. Mackenzie), when he spoke a few moments ago.

First of all, just as a passing remark and one of local importance to me when he talked about labour relations, there has been a strike going on at one of our major industries in Brantford—actually just outside of Brantford, in the great riding of Brant-Oxford-Norfolk—at Pullman Trailmobile Canada Ltd.

Mr. Brandt: Who is the representative there?

Mr. Gillies: The representative for that particular riding is here, of course.

I am very concerned about the fact that this labour dispute between the United Automobile Workers and Pullman Trailmobile has been going on since January. I gather that neither the union nor the company is talking at this time. The negotiations have broken down almost entirely. I have some very grave concerns because, as I talk to the workers of that company who live in my constituency, I feel they want to work. I think we reach a very fundamental problem in this type of dispute, which was alluded to by the member opposite.

The members want to go back to work, and the economy is in a very bad state.

Mr. Wildman: What is the Minister of Labour (Mr. Ramsay) doing?

Mr. Gillies: Working on it. At the same time, I am sure the legitimate concerns of the workers and their union would be such that they would not want to cave in to whatever position the company first puts forward and go back to work, perhaps prematurely before a suitable negotiated settlement has been reached.

I am not saying this is necessarily the case in this particular dispute, but I do have a great concern that at a time of high unemployment, at a time of dislocation in the industrial sector, there might be a tendency for some labour disputes to stretch out longer than they should, simply because in some ways that is in itself an economical short-term solution.

Mr. Wildman: What the member is saying is that it is a management dispute, it is not a labour dispute.

Mr. Gillies: I would say that some employers perhaps can see the value in a factory sitting idle at the current time while labour negotiations go on and people do not work. This has to be unacceptable. At the same time, this would be one of the inadequate solutions that arises out of the current system of labour negotiations that we have.

I can only echo the words of the member for Hamilton East when he said that new mechanisms and new solutions are needed. I would hope that in the current session and in coming years our government and the members opposite will be looking at this as an area of very grave concern.

Mr. Nixon: Your days are numbered.

Mr. Gillies: Never. Another concern alluded to by the previous speaker is the whole question of the changing industrial economy. My constituency, the city of Brantford, is very much a heavy manufacturing city. The major companies, Massey-Ferguson, White Farm Equipment, Pullman Trailmobile and others, are basically steel fabrication plants.

As I read more and more about the so-called microtechnological revolution, and I saw an item on one of the television journals last week about a city in southern California which is now almost entirely dependent upon microtechnological industries, I have to agree again with previous speakers that this does not really provide the whole answer.

There was an item on television last week about a city in California—I believe it was Oakland—and the employment situation there. It became very apparent that many of the microchip industries created a very small number of positions for executives, for engineers and scientists and a very large number of unskilled and fairly low-paying positions for the working men. Many of the people working in these plants in the city that was addressed in this TV program were not the principal breadwinner but a working woman, a second or third member of a family who was working to supplement another income.

It would be a very difficult situation, I would suggest, if we ignore the plight of heavy manufacturing and think that all of the answers and all of the solutions for our future economic development are going to come with microtechnology. What are we going to do with a very large pool of skilled industrial workers who are used to a certain standard of living, a certain standard of wage and a type of work

which, it is becoming evident, is in increasingly short supply?

Mr. Martel: Is that right?

Mr. Gillies: I think it is. Of course, as I turn from both Pullman Trailmobile and those brief points on microtechnology, of great and pressing concern not only to me but to the other elected representatives in the Brantford area, is the situation of White Farm Equipment.

9:20 p.m.

I believe most members of this House are somewhat familiar with the background of that company. It has existed and operated in the city of Brantford for well over 100 years now, originally as the Cockshutt Plow Co., then as Cockshutt Farm Equipment Ltd., and now as White Farm Equipment. In good times, that company has employed over 1,000 people both in manufacturing and in the office. Now there is a mere handful of them working. The member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk (Mr. Nixon), the mayor of Brantford, the federal member for Brant and I met with the workers, the United Auto Workers members, last week to talk about the current situation.

Mr. Conway: Was Mac Makarchuk there?

Mr. Nixon: Mac was not in evidence.

Mr. Gillies: No, my illustrious predecessor was not. I have to assume he had another engagement.

We did meet with the workers and it was not a happy occasion. These people are upset, angry and frustrated. Many of them worked for that company for 15 or 20 years before the current situation and now, with very few of what might be called almost work interruptions, they have not been at their jobs for a period of some two years. The reasons are quite evident. White Farm is not one of the primary farm equipment manufacturers. It accounts for about four per cent of the North American market. As competition increased, as the agricultural economy worsened, its situation in the marketplace became more and more difficult.

I meet regularly with officials both from Massey-Ferguson and White Farm Equipment in my riding—naturally, as they are the two largest and most important employers in my riding—and there has been no glimmer of light in the farm equipment industry in at least the first quarter of 1983. As one executive of Massey-Ferguson said to me in the last couple of weeks, "1982 was a terrible year for the farm equipment industry, and 1983 at this point is looking worse."

White Farm Equipment is in a difficult situation. There were those who said that as interest rates declined things would pick up and the farmers who have been under the gun in the last year or so would start buying equipment again. It is not quite that easy. Interest rates are down, but that is not enough. Commodity prices remain at a low level. We have to remember also that the great bulk of the equipment manufactured in Brantford, both by White Farm Equipment and Massey-Ferguson, is not sold in Canada but is exported.

One problem we are faced with is the agricultural policy of the Reagan administration in which farmers in the United States are actually being subsidized by the federal government simply to let 20 per cent of their acreage lie fallow. They are being paid not to plant their crops. When one considers the already low commodity prices, one can see the marketplace is simply not conducive to the sale of heavy pieces of equipment to farmers.

Another situation that has been damaging has been the incidence of farm bankruptcies in the last year. As farmers have gone bankrupt, good used equipment, combines and tractors, has gone on the market and has been sold at bargain basement prices. The farmer again is in a situation where he can pick up a combine that is perhaps two or three years old for \$30,000 or \$40,000, whereas a new one is going to cost him, depending on the model and type, anywhere between \$80,000 and \$130,000. We have to remember those prices when we talk about farm equipment.

The interest, the carrying charges alone, for a farmer buying a new combine can be in the neighbourhood of \$10,000 or \$15,000 a year. We are not talking about principal. That is the interest alone. The farmer has to be in a very good position in terms of his equity in his farm and in terms of his debt load to invest that kind of money in equipment.

At the meeting last week, where, as I said, all the elected representatives—federal, provincial and municipal—from the Brantford area were in attendance, there was a lot of angry discussion. There were some solutions put forward, many of which appeared attractive at first but which, I think, bear consideration.

The federal member for Brant, Mr. Blackburn, a very fine gentleman and a friend, is a member of the New Democratic Party. He favours, or has emphasized in his statements on White Farm Equipment, the proposition that the federal government should force the current

owners of White Farm Equipment into receivership with the vague suggestion that something better awaits the workers after that happens.

I do not question the motives of my honourable colleague in the federal House, but I do think that is a very shaky proposition to put before these workers. What guarantee do we have that if the current owners of White Farm Equipment go into receivership there is another willing buyer for the company or that some other arrangement could be made?

Mr. Wildman: Did you not support the sale of that company?

Mr. Gillies: Yes, indeed I did. I supported the sale of that company and I happen to think the fact that a buyer was found at the time is the reason that it still exists and that at least some of the people are still working.

Mr. Wildman: A handful.

Mr. Gillies: A handful indeed. It is not a happy situation.

I would put the proposition again for the consideration of members who may read such statements as those made by Mr. Blackburn last week, that White Farm Equipment should be forced into receivership, that some vague promise of a better future awaits those 1,000 workers after that happens. I think we should look at that very carefully and perhaps take it with a grain of salt.

I myself would want to have a better idea of what that future is. I would like to have a better idea whether there is another buyer in the wings, as has been suggested but not confirmed. I would like to know if there is any workable proposal between the two levels of government and the company or between the two levels of government and the workers to create a new White entity.

At the root of all this is simply this fact: no matter who owns the company, no matter who is trying to operate that company and sell the product it makes, the root problem is the marketplace; the product is simply not being sold.

I am aware of figures—which I would certainly not use in this House—I am quite aware of the number of combines sold by the major manufacturers of farm equipment in this country in the last number of months and those figures are just short of frightening. Where I might have guessed that X number of Massey-Ferguson combines were sold in January, in fact I found that the truth was that about one tenth of what I estimated was the case.

I have a tremendous concern, and I might add that we as legislators have to share that concern, because our government has a commitment to White Farm Equipment of some \$7.5 million in taxpayers' dollars—\$5.5 million in loan guarantees and \$2 million in cold, hard cash that the company is already using. I would suggest it is our responsibility as members, and it is certainly the responsibility of the government, not only to work for the continuation of White Farm Equipment and the betterment of the workers, but to safeguard the public's investment in that company. We certainly hope to see an improvement in that situation soon.

Just in the last day I have become aware, through a letter circulated by the president of White Canada to his dealer network, that refinancing arrangements have been completed for the company in the United States. So White US, with its financial backing by Borg Warner Acceptance and other creditors in the United States, may be in a better position to continue than we had previously thought.

I think that gives some reason to be encouraged about the prospects of White Canada. The negotiations between the Ministry of Industry and Trade here and the company continue, and the negotiations continue in Ottawa; we will be awaiting the outcome of those negotiations in the coming weeks with some very grave concern.

Since I last spoke on a throne debate, the situation at Massey-Ferguson is somewhat better. Certainly, their prospects would appear to be somewhat brighter than was the case in months past. About one half of the Brantford work force is working on the day shift at Massey-Ferguson. They are producing and the combines are leaving the plant and the yard, which I know many members see as they pass through Brantford on the train on their way to southwestern Ontario ridings in particular. I often have members from southwestern Ontario come up to me and say, "I passed the Massey plant on Friday and there do not seem to be too many machines in the yard. You must be pretty happy about that;" or conversely, "I saw a sea of red as I drove through Brantford the other day. You must be awfully worried about that." So that is the barometer we keep an eye on.

9:30 p.m.

About half of the workers are in the plant, a full day shift. We have seen in the past year the consolidation, or if you will the rationalization, of some of Massey-Ferguson's American operations into the Brantford operation. I do not particularly disagree with some of the earlier

comments made by members opposite about the nature of our branch plant economy, but I guess it is a small irony that in this particular case the fact that Massey-Ferguson is a Canadian multinational company and has rationalized many of its operations back into Canada is going to be of long-term benefit to the people of Brantford and to the employees of the company. For instance, the manufacture of tractor parts, which was previously done in Des Moines, Iowa, has now been moved to Brantford.

We are also very keenly aware of the comments made by Victor Rice last week at the Massey shareholders' meeting. I am sure some of the members from the west end of Toronto and I would share a concern about the future of the Toronto jobs at Massey-Ferguson. Based on the comments made last week, it would appear that some of the operation in this case may be rationalized from Toronto to Brantford. We do not know at this stage, and I think the time frame used was some two to five years down the road, but I think we will be very concerned to see whether as many of the Toronto jobs are protected either by transfer to Brantford or by early retirement mechanisms or other mechanisms which may be available to the company. We would certainly hope there will not be a large shortfall of jobs if the Toronto Massey-Ferguson plants, as has been suggested by the chairman of the company, do close and move back to Brantford. We will be watching that situation very closely.

Obviously of great concern to me and to my community and to the many employees of that company is the future of Massey-Ferguson. As members of this House, we all must be terribly concerned about the future of that company, not just because of its importance to Canada or because it is one of our larger indigenous corporations in Canada and produces an extremely fine product, which is exported throughout the world and which brings our manufacturing industry in Canada credit throughout the world, but because, when we come down to hard dollars and cents, we have to be concerned because of the very large public investment in that company. In this case there is a total of some \$225 million in loans and loan guarantees by this government, which I think accounts for some \$78 million of that, and by the government of Canada.

We all have an obligation to monitor the ongoing operation of this company and to see that the taxpayers' interest in Massey-Ferguson is protected and that the guarantees made by

Massey-Ferguson and renegotiated within the last year are held to.

The employment levels promised in the original Massey agreement are being held to. I cannot say in all honesty I take a great deal of encouragement from that, because when we speak of about 13 per cent of its worldwide jobs having to be within the borders of our country, obviously 13 per cent of a smaller number of workers is somewhat easier to achieve. Massey-Ferguson's world work force and its worldwide operations have shrunk. Their avowed intention is to become a leaner and more competitive company. In the long run this has to be the solution for Massey-Ferguson.

I would be less than honest if I were to suggest I believe that the 4,000 plus people who have worked in the past for Massey-Ferguson at its peak within Brant county would ever in those numbers again work for that company. I feel that is probably unrealistic and eventually, when the company is back up to three shifts and back up to full production, I would imagine that the full employment of the company in Brantford will be somewhere between 2,500 and 3,000 people. So when I talk about White Farm Equipment or Pullman Trailmobile and Massey, I am really getting at some of the problems that face a basically one-industry town.

I am sure that many members have visited my community at some point. I hear comments from members. Many who have visited for the first time are impressed by what an attractive community it is, and I believe that in my maiden speech in this House I probably went on at great length about what an attractive community it is.

I bring this to mind because as all of the bad economic news hit about the situation in the industrial sector in Brantford in the last two years, there grew an impression, I think, in certain minds, that Brantford was just a mess of smokestacks and factories and was in fact a depressed and unattractive community. Those of us who represent the city do our best at every opportunity to point out to those who have not been there that this is simply not the case. Brantford is in fact a very beautiful and historic city with outstanding cultural and sports facilities and an award-winning parks board.

I may sound as if I am giving a chamber of commerce speech here, but I would urge any members who have a very negative impression of Brantford to go there and visit. I would be pleased to host any member of this House at

breakfast, lunch or dinner any time he would like to come down, because I think—

Mr. Boudria: At any one of them?

Mr. Gillies: I said "breakfast, lunch or dinner," not "and." I make that offer because I think anyone who sees Brantford and sees what a wonderful place it is goes away and becomes an ambassador of that great community himself.

Mr. Epp: I will take you up on that.

Mr. Gillies: I do owe the member for Waterloo North one from the last time I was in his great community, which is also just lovely.

The solution for a town like Brantford, as I see it, has to be the diversification of the industrial base. We are in bad times now; we have been in bad times economically for over a year. But this is nothing new. I talk to older people who have been in politics or the labour movement or the management of companies in Brantford for many years. They will point out to me that the roller-coaster nature of that city's economy has always been the case and is in fact tied to the nature of our industrial base.

It is a simple equation: when farm equipment and the agricultural economy boom, Brantford booms, and with one of the highest industrial wage levels in the province and a very thriving community in good times; but when that agricultural economy and the farm equipment industry go belly up, I had better say or into a slump, then the situation on my community is absolutely devastating when you consider that over 20 per cent of the work force is directly or indirectly employed in the farm equipment industry.

So in our attempts to draw new employment into the city the thrust we have used co-operatively as the representatives of the area has been based on the premise that on any given day we would rather have 10 companies come in, each employing 100 people, than one company employing 1,000.

I am not particularly in the habit of throwing bouquets at the government of Canada and at times I am as critical of many of their policies as are many members of this House, but I do point to the very positive benefits that the designation of Brant county under the industry and labour adjustment program has had. We have seen new, small companies locate in Brantford, and people are being hired and taken up by these companies—not in massive numbers: 50 here, 80 there, 12 there; I see this as the key to the future prosperity of that community.

When I see smaller companies like Westcan

moving into Brantford, I take a great deal of encouragement from that. I might add that we are not talking necessarily about high-technology companies; we are just talking about the kinds of companies, as in the case of Westcan, that make something as simple as baseboard heaters; but they are making them, and they are making a good product. They are making it at a very competitive price and it is selling. This is a trend we should continue. Many of these industry and labour adjustment program companies are coming into Brantford with the co-operation of and with various types of financial assistance through the Ontario Development Corp.

9:40 p.m.

Over the couple of years I have been the member for Brantford, I have seen many small enterprises assisted in Brantford through the Ontario Development Corp. If one tallied them all up, it would come to over 600 jobs; but it is not headline news because, as I said, we are talking about smaller enterprises which get loan guarantees, loans, grants or whatever assistance is available for them in order to set up. Over a period of time it all adds up.

I have some hope for the future. I also have some great concerns about the major employers in my area, but I have to think that in the coming months there will be somewhat more reasonable commodity prices for our farmers and for farmers throughout North America. With a few other beneficial changes we could see a great turnaround in the farm equipment industry. I do not expect it overnight. I guess I become a little frustrated sometimes because Brantford did slump into the recession very early, as the farm equipment industry was one of the first to go bad, even before the auto sector. I do not see it pulling out of the recession early either.

Mr. Martel: They need a good member, that's all.

Mr. Gillies: I do not necessarily tie it to that, but my friend has a point.

Mr. Martel: I did not think he would agree with me.

Mr. Gillies: I would like to turn from those somewhat localized concerns and the opportunity to speak about them to another area about which I have great concern and some responsibility. It was touched on in the throne speech. It is the whole area of youth employment. I have tremendous concerns about the future of our young people but, at the same time, I see great things happening and programs being devel-

oped which are going to be of benefit to young people throughout the province.

These things are happening largely because of the leadership and guidance given to the youth secretariat by the Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Mrs. Birch), who is doing an outstanding job in very difficult circumstances of showing some light and hope for the young people of this province. I am going to take severe exception at this time to those callous and unfeeling members of the opposition who have found it fashionable in recent days to criticize my minister because of the breadth of her responsibilities and the breadth of her concerns, saying she and the secretariat are not doing the job they are designed to do. They are dead wrong.

I have watched this minister for two years. The members opposite may be interested to know that in two weeks I am coming to my biennial at the youth secretariat which we will probably be celebrating. We have seen the growth and development of programs for the benefit of young people.

One of the earlier speakers mentioned, quite correctly, the grave situation for the young unemployed in the current economy, with some 235,000 young people in this province out of work. To put that on a percentage basis we should be aware that while the national unemployment rate in Canada hovers between about 12 and 13 per cent, at the current time it is much higher among young people, over 20 per cent. I have some concerns. My concern is simply—

Mr. Martel: Your government has done nothing.

Interjections.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Cousens): Order.

Mr. Gillies: I am just warming up.

I have some concern that the focus of public concern may be shifting away from our young people. Why do I say this? Partly, I think, it is because of demographics. Let us throw our minds back to the 1960s when the great strides being made in policy in this province were in the field of education, when we saw the development of Ontario's modern and first-class system of education. What were the issues on the front pages of the newspapers in the 1960s? They were issues of interest to young people. They were issues such as unrest on campus and things that were of primary focus to the young.

In the 1970s—and I am sure honourable members would agree with me—the developing issues were those of health care. Perhaps educa-

tion as a focus of public concern started to take a bit of a back seat.

My experience and the experience of some of my friends in this chamber would point out, I am absolutely convinced, that in the coming 10 years the great public issue, not only in this province but in this country, is going to be in the field of pensions. Some of the things we uncovered in the select committee on pensions give us great reasons to be concerned.

This is no accident. This shift in focus is simply a reflection—

Mr. Boudria: Look at how we have progressed on that issue.

The Acting Speaker: Order.

Mr. Gillies:—of the ageing society in which we live. What we are seeing is a change in the demographic makeup of our population.

Where does that leave the young people? Where does that leave the people who are leaving school now? Where does it leave the ones who are looking to the future and wondering where they will be some years down the road? It is a very serious situation.

Mr. Boudria: Are you going to give them pensions?

Mr. Gillies: I would suggest the problem is deep, but we have to look at the unemployment figure as it pertains to young people. Yes, there is about 20 per cent across the board unemployment, but as I point out whenever I am speaking to a group of young people, as I do periodically, the unemployment rate among young people who leave the school system at about grade nine or 10 rises to over 30 per cent. Among those who finish high school, it falls to around 15 per cent and among those who have a university degree, a college certificate, or apprenticeship training, it falls to around eight or nine per cent.

This is very significant and I always try to make the point on campuses and in schools that despite all the talk one hears that it does not matter any more in the 1980s whether one finishes school or not because there are no jobs, the facts are simply to the contrary. The biggest favour young persons can do themselves in this tight economy is to stay in school, finish their education and get as much training as they can. It is still beneficial in this day and age.

In the last year, 1982-83, on youth employment programs alone, and I am not talking about the Canada-Ontario employment development program and I am not talking about job creation programs that affect the whole work-

ing population, we have spent over \$90 million to create over 90,000 jobs.

I was greatly encouraged when I saw the reference on April 18 when His Honour spoke to us, when he alluded to the fact that in the coming budget the spending on youth employment programs alone will rise to some \$120 million, an increase of some \$30 million. Yet I come here and I open the paper in the morning and I repeatedly hear my friends opposite saying that we are spending less money on youth employment than we have in the past.

Let me ask some of my friends on this side, many of whom know a lot more about math than I do, since when is \$120 million less than \$90 million? Can somebody help me with that, please?

Mr. Brandt: They cannot add.

Mr. Gillies: They cannot add; they do not know the answer. I will send it over—\$120 million to create many new jobs for young people. A copy was just delivered to my seat mate. I should send it opposite.

Mr. Shymko: En français.

Mr. Gillies: En français, aussi—mais \$120 million, as opposed to \$90 million.

9:50 p.m.

Am I nearly finished? I am coming to the conclusion of my remarks, I am led to understand.

The programs of the Provincial Secretary for Social Development—the experience program; the student venture capital program; the new winter experience program; the Ontario career action program, under our colleague the Minister of Colleges and Universities (Miss Stephenson); the Ontario youth employment program, which is so popular with the farmers and the small business people of this province and which is administered by our colleague the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Mr. Bennett)—are doing a tremendous job. They are doing their bit to cut into this massive unemployment problem among the young.

We now read in His Honour's speech that these programs will be enriched. Our already tremendous commitment to youth employment will be enriched and more people will participate in those programs this year than ever before. More people will find themselves in job situations; and I trust that many of them, once they have that first work experience, will be able to go on and find jobs in the marketplace.

One last point before I wrap up. Because we ran the winter experience program for the first time during the past couple of months, I had an

opportunity to go into several communities where we were running it. I spent a day in Niagara Falls and a day in Oshawa. I had no idea or preconception as to how many of the participants in that short-term program would find jobs or be retained in jobs at the end of the program.

I am sure members know how winter experience operates. Through the youth employment counselling centres—we now have 29 across the province, and we are heading for 50—young people are placed with a private sector employer for a period of no more than 20 weeks. They receive training, they work and are paid, albeit not handsomely, for that period of 20 weeks.

Frankly, I had no preconception as to what percentage of them might find themselves in an employment situation at the end of the program. We are doing a study of that now, and I can tell honourable members that the figures are very encouraging indeed. In fact, among the young people I spoke to in Oshawa when I toured the program there, more than half of them had either a full-time job or a part-time job arising out their winter experience jobs. This was a much higher figure than I had expected, and I take a great deal of encouragement from it.

These opportunities made available by the youth secretariat gave some of these young people their first jobs in two years. It gave some of them their first glimmer of hope, their first indication that there was anything for them. Many of them now have developed the confidence to find a place in the work force.

If I get a little angry when I hear unjust criticism of what we are trying to do, that is why. I do not hear the criticism or the endless negative comments from the young people in the programs. I do not hear it from the people who are being given a chance by this government. I hear it from people who have not taken the time to go out to talk to the participants and see what we are doing.

I will stand by the efforts of this government, by our overwhelming commitment to the young people of this province and by the outstanding leadership of the Provincial Secretary for Social Development in co-ordinating those efforts.

Mr. J. M. Johnson: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that you have recognized me, and I thank you for doing that. I hope you will pay attention to some of the comments I have to make, because they especially relate to your part of the province.

A year ago I felt the three major important

concerns we had as a government were inflation, unemployment and high interest rates.

Inflation, in the combination of world events, because of the American economy and for whatever reasons—not that we take any credit for it—has moderated, and I think we are in better shape in that regard. Interest rates, for the same reasons, have come down; and again we are very pleased that has happened. Unfortunately, unemployment has not moderated, and it is of concern to every single member of this Legislature.

I have a personal stake in the unemployment situation. My son was laid off last week. He has worked for several years with one of the best construction companies in the province and he was laid off because of lack of work. We talk about retraining and things of this nature, but that is not going to solve such a problem. It is a fact of the economy of the province and we have to face up to it. I firmly believe it is time we took some incentive in job creation programs, in some type of public works programs that would provide employment for people in this kind of trade, and also that we should stimulate the economy in other ways.

In the riding I represent, Wellington-Dufferin-Peel, which is basically rural and small business, the people have suffered greatly from the high interest rates. The farmers especially have paid the price in the last few years, as has the small business community. I personally was in business for over 30 years, and I know the amount of support a small business community receives from any level of government. It is not very much. I do not think anyone should take credit for what we do for the small business community because, frankly, it is not that great. I speak as a member of the government.

Actually I am not sure business people want that kind of support. When I was in business, my main concern was the less government involvement, the better. We wanted to be left alone to do our own thing, to stimulate our business in the best way we could. We did not look for government assistance. We did not want programs and we did not want handouts.

I think most in the business community feel that way. Just give them the climate they can work in to the best of their ability, do not interfere with business and do not saddle them with collecting a lot of taxes and a lot of obligations they do not want. This year, with the interest rates moderating, our business community has an opportunity to advance again into the kind of constructive trade they are capable

of. I think, without interference, they will do this.

The farming community, if given a chance, can again come back to the level it was at three or four years ago and start to improve. I have some concerns about the farming community. One concern which I support, that has been mentioned on occasion in this House, is foreign absentee ownership of our farm lands. This is something the government has started to address. I hope it will take a more serious look at it, because I really do feel there could be a problem in the future. I understand the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Ashe) has introduced a bill that addresses one loophole we have in the registration of foreign ownership. I am not too sure if it covers the complete spectrum.

I happen to feel there is an area that could be overlooked. I have made a survey in my riding and there are many thousands of acres of land that have been sold to corporations and nobody can tell me who owns the land. They give us a name but they cannot tell us whether they reside in Ontario or if they are Canadian residents. I find it disturbing to think there is a possibility that our land is being sold to people we cannot trace. If this is the case, then I submit it is time our government took a look at it to make sure we close that loophole as well.

10 p.m.

In the speech from the throne it was suggested assistance will be made available to young farmers in this coming budget. I truly hope this is a fact because young farmers cannot get into farming today with the high costs. I hope we do address this major problem in this coming budget.

We talked of transit service and the need for it. There is no greater need in any part of the province than in my riding. We have many elderly people and students who certainly need some type of public transit. There is very little of it provided in Wellington-Dufferin-Peel. I hope the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Snow) takes a look at this part of the province. I am sure other members share this same concern.

Mr. Haggerty: You have Gray Coach there.

Mr. J. M. Johnson: I would like to mention three or four other points, but I understand there are two or three members, including the member for Oxford (Mr. Treleaven), who would like to speak, so I will not take too long. But I would like to mention one thing that was mentioned in the throne speech, that is equal

opportunity for women. I am very concerned about this for a personal reason because I have four granddaughters. I think it is time we took a hard look at this approach.

I understand the federal minister stated that we are up to 47 or 48 per cent in terms of jobs with equal opportunities for women. I am not sure if this is right or not, but if that is true it is totally unacceptable. We have to go much further than that. Because I have four granddaughters and no grandsons, I am very disturbed about this. It is a personal concern. I do think the time is ripe, that we must look at the future and make the changes that are necessary. We cannot do it overnight, and there is an economic cost built into it, but in all fairness we do have that responsibility to see if we cannot address this problem.

My good friend the member for Lakeshore (Mr. Kolyn) reminded me of another issue that I did want to address tonight. It is in relation to the stockyards. I know one of our members has a personal concern in this, and I certainly respect that, but I do think that today the major concern should be for the welfare of the farming community. If Toronto has to live with the stockyards for another three, five or 10 years, then so be it, but for heaven's sake, do not make a change today that is going to be detrimental to the farming community.

I thank you for your patience and indulgence.

Hon. Mr. Gregory: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: I am wondering if we can have a ruling from the chair. The main clock shows about 26 minutes or 27 minutes to go and the digital clock shows 29 minutes. Can we have a ruling from the chair as to which clock we follow?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Brandt): I thank the member for the question, which I have looked forward to with great anticipation. We will be following the main, older clock with respect to the time.

M. Shymko: M. le Président, tout d'abord, cela nous indique que ce qui est ancien peut être considéré comme une marque de stabilité; on conteste par contre souvent ce qui est moderne. Il y a donc une certaine stabilité à conserver les traditions.

Je voudrais ce soir donner une ampleur nationale au discours du Tret au commentaire qui en a été fait. J'espère que la réaction de mes collègues députés sera favorable, malgré ce qui s'est passé lors de réunions il y a quelques jours.

Il faut tout d'abord admettre que les problèmes économiques que nous éprouvons sont pour la

plupart le résultat d'une situation du monde occidental dans son ensemble, situation dont on ressent l'ampleur et les effets tant au Canada que dans la province de l'Ontario.

Réactions.

M. Shymko: Vous voyez, M. le Président, le respect que l'on a pour la langue française.

M. Gillies: Oui, c'est vrai, c'est vrai.

M. Shymko: C'est la réaction socialiste quand on parle français. J'espère que mes collègues du Parti néo-démocrate vont me permettre de continuer—

M. Gillies: C'est dommage, c'est dommage.

M. Shymko: Je demandais simplement la permission, M. le Président, de continuer en français. Je remercie mon cher ami le député de Cornwall (M. Samis), pour la compréhension dont il fait preuve en matière de bilinguisme officiel.

Je voudrais dire, deuxièmement, que malgré l'influence de l'état économique du monde industriel occidental sur notre société, on doit néanmoins prendre des mesures pour parvenir à une certaine reprise de l'activité économique dans cette province. N'oublions pas qu'en ce qui concerne le che, on a atteint un niveau sans précédent dans notre histoire depuis la guerre. Alors nos priorités visent à éliminer le taux élevé de chômage en Ontario. Et nous considérons comme priorités les initiatives qui vont procurer des emplois à nos travailleurs. On parle, dans le discours du tr de 176 millions de dollars; mais selon une indication du 19 avril, on vient de verser 188,9 millions pour créer environ 14 210 emplois. C'est là un exemple, je le rappelle au député de Cornwall, de l'attitude sérieuse de ce gouvernement quant à l'épanouissement économique.

On doit faire face également au taux de l'inflation. Et nous voyons très bien certains signes d'activité économique assez intensifs qui ont un effet sur l'inflation. L'Ontario doit créer, et commence à le faire, tant dans le secteur privé que dans le secteur public, un climat de confiance. C'est cet esprit de confiance qui compte, comme vous le savez; je le rappelle aux députés, particulièrement à ceux du Parti néo-démocrate. Vous savez que le grand philosophe français Pascal a dit: "Le coeur a ses raisons que la raison ne connaît point." La confiance en soi, la confiance en cette province, la confiance en notre société aura un effet spirituel et psychologique qui nous donnera plus de pouvoir pour sortir de l'état économique pitoyable où nous sommes; cela vaut mieux que d'écouter les

discours toujours pessimistes du Parti néo-démocrate pour qui c'est toujours la fin du monde—

M. Gillies: C'est vrai, c'est vrai.

M. Shymko: Et c'est là qu'on détruit la force essentielle nécessaire à l'épanouissement économique.

M. Gillies: Les misérables, les misérables.

M. Shymko: Oui, ce sont des misérables, et je ne sais pas s'ils sont capables de lire la littérature classique française, comme vous savez—

Je ne sais pas ce qu'on trouvera dans le budget de le Trésorier, député de Muskoka, (M. F. S. Miller) mais espérons que ce sont des projets, des objectifs qui vont stimuler considérablement les investissements commerciaux au moins au cours des deux prochaines années. J'espère qu'on trouvera aussi des projets, des objectifs qui vont faire doubler le commerce extérieur, qui permettront d'augmenter la productivité de cette province.

J'espère que dans le secteur des syndicats—

Réactions.

M. Shymko: Oui je vais terminer. J'espère que dans le secteur des syndicats, au lieu de voir toujours la lutte entre le patronat et les syndicats, de voir des conflits perpétuels entre le patron—le boss—et le travailleur, nous allons parvenir à un climat de collaboration entre ces deux parties très importantes. De même, nous essayons de créer un climat de collaboration, et non de conflit, avec le gouvernement fédéral, ce que nous voyons de temps en temps, notamment entre l'Honorable Lloyd Axworthy et le ministre du Travail (M. Ramsay) à propos des 188 millions de dollars. Voilà un exemple de collaboration et de confiance, n'est-ce pas. Mes collègues libéraux seront totalement d'accord.

Je ne vais pas parler du point le plus important pour la francophonie de cette province, à savoir la demande qui a été faite pour garantir l'instruction en français à 93 706 élèves de l'Ontario. Je suis certain que le premier à le reconnaître sera le député d'Ottawa-Est (M. Roy). Voilà le courage de cette administration; voilà le vrai gouvernement conservateur, sensible aux besoins des francophones, qui comprend—

Réactions.

M. Shymko: —qui comprend ce qui se passe dans la province du Québec pour ce qui est des droits qu'on donne à la minorité nationale. Espérons que Monsieur René Lévesque fera la

même chose. Mais ici en Ontario, nous donnerons aux autres provinces l'exemple à suivre.

Réactions.

M. Shymko: Voilà. Je voudrais terminer sur une note d'optimisme. Si vous regardez dans les deux tomes de L'économie de l'Ontario que je vous montre, vous trouverez à la page 8 ceci: Au cours de la période de 1981 à 1985, le produit national brut enregistrera une augmentation réelle de 1,9 pour cent, et entre 1986 et 1990, une augmentation de 3,3 pour cent.

10:10 p.m.

So we see an optimistic projection, an increase in the real gross national product growth, from 1985 to 1986, of 1.9 to 3.3 per cent. Inflation, which currently is approximately 12 per cent, 10.1 per cent on average between 1981 and 1985, will decrease to 9.1 per cent in 1986 and to 8.9 per cent in 1991. That is an optimistic projection. The unemployment rate will decrease from 10.3 per cent now to nine per cent. Here is the result of the calculations of those who have the ability and the expertise to project an optimistic note, of which the members of the New Democratic Party should be, and are, reminded every day.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for allowing me to comment briefly in French,—dans la langue officielle de ce pays et de l'esprit du jour de cette province.

Mr. Gordon: Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure for me to have this opportunity to speak in the throne speech debate, although I have to admit that these clocks make me feel rather bilious. At one time, I was even informed that the socialists here objected to the fact that there was a red light on the top of this building when the House was sitting and demanded that it be taken away because they thought it reflected Liberalism, but when I look at that those green lights on the clocks, I must say I always thought green was the colour for the socialists. That is another reason we should remove these clocks: they keep reminding us of the socialist hordes that are waiting out there.

I want to speak this evening about the future of this province and about the future of the great region that I represent, the Sudbury region. It is a region of approximately 167,000 people, a region that has very industrious people, a region that is very proud of what it has accomplished and a region that does have a great future.

I would like to talk briefly about that future this evening, because we have seen a lot of negative remarks about the Sudbury area in the

press here in this city. We also hear negative remarks, and we have heard them for about at least the past 12 years, from the members who sit across in the section that is identified as being green on my seating plan; perhaps they will remain nameless for now.

Nevertheless, I must say there have been a number of steps taken within the Sudbury region. The footings are being laid at present for the future of our city, of my riding and of northern Ontario. Speaking of those footings, I first of all have to point out that in the throne speech that preceded this one there were comments about a mining machinery advisory board that was to be established within my riding. After a great deal of consultation with the ministers involved and with the Board of Industrial Leadership and Development, that was expanded to become one of our six technology centres in this province.

I might also remind those on the other side that this technology centre now has a budget of approximately \$20.3 million, which will be spent over the next four and a half years to develop the capabilities for research which will help the mining and forestry people and the machinery and equipment people to find export markets as well as markets within the North American continent.

I might add that another avenue this technology centre is going to follow is that of becoming involved in joint ventures with the private sector. There are already a number of promising developments that have come before the board of the Ontario Centre for Resource Machinery.

Besides the Ontario Centre for Resource Machinery in my riding in the city of Sudbury, approximately 10 days ago the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Pope) and I also announced a waferboard plant for the Sudbury region. This will mean employment in the Sudbury region for over 425 workers. That means we are diversifying within the region. It is an industry we have never had before and it is going to mean my people are going to have jobs.

10:20 p.m.

I might also add there is another interesting development within the Sudbury area and we are expecting an announcement within the near future. I might just announce it tonight if the federal Liberals can get their act together. At the present moment the Minister of Mines, Judy Erola, is still trying to decide whether she can find some money out of Lalonde's budget for MECO. For those members who are not aware,

MECO is the Mining Equipment Co. of Ontario, a mining machinery company that has been formed by John Clark and Inco.

It is our belief that over a period of years we should see anywhere between 100 and 200 workers involved in the mining machinery business within the Sudbury region. Our government will be contributing towards that plant. We are still waiting for the federal Liberals to decide whether or not they are going to participate. I would suggest they will since they will have an election coming up soon and they are going to have to try to do something.

When I look down at the row in front, I can see the member for Burlington South (Mr. Kerr) who was formerly the Minister of Environment in this province and he was a very great minister. As a matter of fact, I can remember meeting him one time. Members on the other side will be interested in this. I remember meeting him at a luncheon that was given by Inco out at their guest retreat at Copper Cliff. What brings it back is when I look across and see the socialists on the other side, I remember how for years and years they used to lambaste Inco. They talked about what an awful company it was and how they had to get Inco and take away its profits and force it to clean up its act, to clean up the pollution problem and so forth. They kept drumming this into the people of Sudbury time and again, over and over again; that it was the company and they were rich and something had to be done about it.

In this Legislature just a few days ago, we heard the member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Laughren) say, "The Ontario government should do it now. Make the rich pay." Those people they are always talking about are the taxpayers of Ontario. "Make the rich pay."

The problem is, those fellows over there have been hoisted with their own petard in the Sudbury region. As a result of that, their credibility has gone down the tubes. I am shocked that the member for Sudbury East (Mr. Martel) is not here to hear me this evening. I just cannot believe it. I would have thought that—

Mr. Nixon: He heard you were on the speaker's list.

Mr. Gordon: I am sure he is coming. I am sure he is on his way back up the stairs. Would someone go and get him.?

Mr. Philip: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: The member happens to be in the resources committee at the present time.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Cousens): That is not a point of order. There are seven minutes left in this debate. Do not believe the green clocks.

Mr. Gordon: Mr. Speaker, I had hoped you would have had that closet Conservative here to hear me speak, since I think it is something very important to him.

Nevertheless, I think it is time I turned over this particular speaking spot in the Legislature to another great speaker. The member for Oxford (Mr. Treleaven) is going to carry on. I turn it over to him.

Mr. Treleaven: Mr. Speaker, it is correct to say this is another great speaker in the line of back-bench Tory speakers this evening.

Mr. Charlton: Yes. None of you can last for more than five minutes.

The Acting Speaker: Order.

Mr. Treleaven: The honourable whip asked me to clean up and really with five minutes left, it does make one feel like the man who follows—

Mr. Charlton: Good speech. Time.

Mr. Treleaven: Yes, thank you. It makes one feel like the man who follows the horses and elephants at the end of the parade to clean up after such an illustrious group.

Mr. Shymko: You know where the horses sit.

Mr. Treleaven: Yes.

Mr. Speaker, I would generally like to give congratulations in this speech tonight. First I would like to thank the Minister of Labour (Mr. Ramsay), the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) and all others who are responsible for the Canada-Ontario employment development program.

We have heard the members of the third party speak negatively of the COED program. I want to mention that the good burghers in the riding of Oxford have received over \$2 million and over 200 jobs, which amount to about 100 job-years, from the COED program. More is coming in all the time. I might say this also includes that small portion of Oxford that I do not represent, but I am sort of looking after the statistics for the small portion that the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk (Mr. Nixon) represents.

I also congratulate the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Snow). This morning on my way—was it this morning?

Interjections.

Mr. Treleaven: It must have been yesterday. One day seems like another in the Legislature. They are all filled with joy.

On the way to this place from Oxford I

stopped in at various points on Highway 403, mainly in the riding of my friend the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk. I must congratulate the minister on having four clearing crews working in four different spots, two in Oxford and two in Brant, two brushing crews. I might mention to the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk that brushing crews do not paint; they clear brush. I thought I would clarify that for my friend.

Might I also ask my friend the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk if he could have a meeting with the member for Wentworth North (Mr. Cunningham)? The Minister of Transportation and Communications is waiting for those two Liberal members to get together to recommend to him—I know the member knows what is coming—an increase in the speed limit along Highway 2 between Brantford and Hamilton.

Mr. Gillies: They won't do it, because Eric Cunningham doesn't want it.

Mr. Treleaven: That's correct. The Liberal caucus should get together on the topic.

In two-and-a-half minutes I have very little to touch on. I would like to touch on the primary concern of the county of Oxford, again including that small portion of Oxford that my friend represents.

Mr. Nixon: The richest part of the county.

Mr. Treleaven: Yes, it is Blandford-Blenheim township, which does not have any adequate garbage facilities of its own.

I would like to touch on the subject of landfill sites in Oxford. Oxford has been blessed with the longest landfill site hearing in Canadian history, 59 days. The county of Oxford has spent \$1.6 million to this date, and two townships have spent about \$200,000 each, a total of \$2 million. They started their search in 1973. The county bought the site at Salford in 1975, 300-odd acres. In 1982 there were hearings, and now we have an appeal before the cabinet as to whether or not the hearing of the joint board will stand.

The member for Essex North (Mr. Ruston) referred to landfill sites in his speech yesterday. I suggest that we need two things in this province. One is public education. For too long in this province we have been used to dealing with garbage as something for which we find the nearest hole, dump it in, cover it up and that is it. Spend \$7 a person per year and garbage looks after itself; we must now educate the public to expect to pay \$50 a person per year to look after their garbage. They will do so with their road

budget but they will not consider garbage as a primary concern.

10:30 p.m.

Second, we must amend the environmental acts so we may have speedy legislation, with democracy taking its place and having all the protections the people wish, but we must have speedy disposition which precludes lengthy references to the courts.

In clearing up, I would like simply to say that, with the Premier's (Mr. Davis) thoughts of running federally, I hope the Premier runs so he can bring to all of Canada the enlightenment he has brought to this House, and do all of Canada that favour. However, if he stays with us, he will continue with the enlightened leadership we have seen for 12 years.

On motion by Mr. McClellan, the debate was adjourned.

EDUCATION FOR MENTALLY HANDICAPPED

The Acting Speaker: Pursuant to standing order 28, the question that this House do now adjourn is deemed to have been made. The member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Laughren) has given notice of dissatisfaction with the answer to a question given by the Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Drea). The member has up to five minutes to debate the matter and the minister may reply for up to five minutes.

Mr. Laughren: Mr. Speaker, I am not surprised the minister is not here.

Let me tell members the problem which prompted this late night debate. In the Sudbury area, there are a number of young, mentally retarded people in the school system who have speech problems. These children require speech pathology services. They require an assessment be done in the first instance and that a program, as a result of that assessment, be put in place in the school system.

In Sudbury, the Sudbury Algoma Sanitorium has refused to do any assessments or programs for school-aged children because of lack of funding. It has said it is the responsibility of the school system to provide that service.

The school system, on the other hand, says: "We recognize the fact there are mentally retarded children in our system who require assessment and who require programs and follow-up on those programs, but we do not have the funds. It is up to the Ministry of Community and

Social Services or the Ministry of Health to provide that service."

The Ministry of Community and Social Services and the Ministry of Health say that under Bill 82 it is the responsibility of the school boards to provide that service.

That is the situation as it now stands in the Sudbury area. Even for preschool children, at the Sudbury Algoma Sanitorium there is a one-year waiting list. If the child happens to be of school age, the only place there is a service available is in the English section of the separate school board system. A child in the French section of the separate school board or the entire public school system does not have the services required.

Let me tell the members how ridiculous the situation is. There were a number of students in the area I represent who could not get an assessment and could not get a program. An advocacy agency went to service clubs in the area and obtained funding to get an assessment done and a program for those children.

We have reached the point in this province where this government is allowing charity to replace what should be a service provided to all children in the school system in Ontario. That is not the kind of system we think is appropriate for Ontario.

The school boards say, "We cannot do anything about it because we are not getting the funding from the Ministry of Education." Right in the middle, guess who is caught in the squeeze? It is the children. At the same time the Minister of Community and Social Services is stating he wants to put children from institutions back into the community, he is doing something that is going to guarantee that more of these children will require institutional care in the future. If young people do not get the kind of program they require, namely speech pathology in this case, then those children, some of whom are completely noncommunicative, will end up being required to go into institutions in the years to come, those same institutions the minister is closing across the province.

Surely that is not the kind of system we want in Ontario. When the Minister of Community and Social Services stands up—and I hear him bluster when I put that question to him, "I am greatly offended"—what he says is: "It works everywhere else in Ontario. If it does not work in Sudbury, it is not my problem."

I am really surprised. The Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Mrs. Birch) was in

her seat not five minutes ago and chose to leave. This is also indicative of her interest in this whole matter. Here we have a classic case where the provincial secretary, given the umbrella role she is supposed to play, could pull into her office the boards of education, the Ministry of Health and the Community and Social Services people

and say, "You people work out this problem;" because what is being done is simply not adequate, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker: I thank the honourable member. The five minutes have elapsed.

The House adjourned at 10:37 p.m.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, May 3, 1983

Throne speech debate

Mr. Bradley.	439
Mr. Mackenzie.	444
Mr. Gillies.	452
Mr. J. M. Johnson.	459
Mr. Shymko.	461
Mr. Gordon.	462
Mr. Treleaven.	464

Other business

Education for mentally handicapped, Mr. Laughren.	465
Adjournment.	466

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Boudria, D. (Prescott-Russell L)
 Bradley, J. J. (St. Catharines L)
 Brandt, A. S., Acting Speaker (Sarnia PC)
 Charlton, B. A. (Hamilton Mountain NDP)
 Conway, S. G. (Renfrew North L)
 Cousens, D., Deputy Chairman and Acting Speaker (York Centre PC)
 Cureatz, S. L., Deputy Speaker and Chairman (Durham East PC)
 Epp, H. A. (Waterloo North L)
 Gillies, P. A. (Brantford PC)
 Gordon, J. K. (Sudbury PC)
 Gregory, Hon. M. E. C., Minister without Portfolio (Mississauga East PC)
 Hennessy, M. (Fort William PC)
 Laughren, F. (Nickel Belt NDP)
 Mackenzie, R. W. (Hamilton East (NDP)
 Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
 Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
 Philip, E. T. (Etobicoke NDP)
 Roy, A. J. (Ottawa East L)
 Shymko, Y. R. (High Park-Swansea PC)
 Treleaven, R. L. (Oxford PC)
 Wildman, B. (Algoma NDP)



Hansard

Official Report of Debates

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Third Session, 32nd Parliament

Thursday, May 5, 1983

Afternoon Sitting

Speaker: Honourable John M. Turner

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

Contents of the proceedings reported in this issue of Hansard appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of the speakers taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is \$15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, Information Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 965-2238.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Thursday, May 5, 1983

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the opposition, may I say "Welcome back" to the Premier (Mr. Davis). But I think you should send forth a little expedition to find out why brothers Grossman, Walker and Timbrell are not here applauding the return to the House of the Premier today.

Mr. T. P. Reid: They jumped out of the Macdonald Block last night.

Mr. Peterson: They may be in the cell down in the basement.

Mr. T. P. Reid: The sound of screaming could be heard for miles—all the way from Switzerland.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: That's the Liberal tie the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Peterson) is wearing; it has every colour of the rainbow.

Mr. Peterson: I am going to ask the Premier a question, and he can talk about my tie on that occasion if he would like to do so; it is as relevant as anything.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I didn't say anything about your tie at all, except that you need sunglasses.

ORAL QUESTIONS

YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, the Premier is no doubt aware that we had some 233,000 unemployed young people aged 15 to 24 in this province last month, constituting an unemployment rate of about 22.2 per cent; and for males that is almost one in four who is unemployed. The Premier will realize, I am sure, that while the young people make up only 19 per cent of the population, they currently account for 41 per cent of the unemployment of Ontario.

With these high levels of youth unemployment, I am asking the Premier why his government is not responding. He is aware, of course, that the last budget's supplementary allocation of some \$7 million to the Ontario youth employment program was underspent by some \$6.3 million; so even the money that has been allocated is not being spent. It is creating, in this

year's terms, some 11,000 fewer jobs than in 1981 or 1982, and 13,000 fewer jobs than in 1980-81. So the government response, given the magnitude of the problem, has been very dismal.

When is the Premier going to direct his government and his Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) to direct resources into this most critical problem?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the government is aware of the concern expressed by the Leader of the Opposition. This has been addressed by the government in the past and will continue to be so. I suggest that he wait until roughly four o'clock on Tuesday afternoon.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Mr. Speaker, is the Premier aware that about 160,000 Ontarians will turn 19 years of age in 1983 and that, of this group, about 95,000 will either drop out of school or get no further apprenticeship or gain other skills? What does he intend to do about the fact that about 78,000 people will enter the work force with neither a university degree, a college diploma, completed apprenticeship nor certification?

Can the Premier indicate now exactly which direction we are heading in to provide these people, who otherwise are going to be permanently unemployed, with some hope for the future?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am far more optimistic and have far more confidence in the future of this province than perhaps has the honourable member. If he looks back historically, that confidence and optimism is based on substantial fact. I think it is fair to state that, compared with almost any other jurisdiction with the same growth in that age group, unlike West Germany, the United Kingdom, etc., our record in this province really is unequalled by those of comparable jurisdictions.

I suggest to the honourable member that if he too, along with his leader, waits until approximately four o'clock on Tuesday, I anticipate that the Treasurer will have some observations to make.

Mr. Cooke: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that in Mr. Lalonde's budget he is projecting unemployment is going to be running at 12 per cent this year, 11 per cent next year and 10 per

cent after that, and obviously that means youth unemployment is going to continue at around 20 per cent, is the Premier prepared to assure us that in next week's budget there will be major job creation programs addressed to the young people of this province so that we do not continue to have more and more young people unemployed, a generation of young people who will never experience the value and dignity of work in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I say to the honourable member, who is once again on a bit of a fantasy flight, that no generation is going to be without employment. I do not agree with Mr. Lalonde's projections. They may be relatively accurate; I do not know. All I can say is that former federal budgets have not always been totally accurate.

It is fair to state that once again, as I said to the member for Rainy River, if one looks back at the historical record of this province and compares it with that of any other industrialized community in North America, one will find that not only have we been able to assimilate people within the work force in competitive numbers—in fact, better than in most jurisdictions—but also that once again will be the future of this province.

I suggest that for the member to hint there will be a whole generation of young people without employment is just totally inaccurate but consistent with his point of view on many other issues, which once again has been totally inaccurate since he has been a member of the House.

Mr. Mancini: Mr. Speaker, in 1980-81 this government spent \$58.80 per person on programs for unemployed youth. In 1981-82 this fell to \$53.94. Last year, real funding levels were cut even further to \$45.28. Given the announced funding cutbacks and the current employment trends, the ratio probably will fall to about \$36 for the 1983-84 fiscal year.

Will the Premier ask the Treasurer to accept the suggestion I gave to him yesterday in an open letter and use moneys from the unnecessary government advertising in the Ontario youth employment program so the youth of this province will have an opportunity to find work this summer, fall and winter?

2:10 p.m.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I actually read the open letter from the honourable member. I really understand his creative approach, but I find it a shade unfortunate that he is attempting

in a statistical way to evaluate either government programs or the successful nature of our employment programs for youth based on a percentage of the dollar.

With respect, if the member looks at the total commitment last year—I think it was in the neighbourhood of \$21 million—he will find that it provided a large number of jobs for young people in this province. He will find on Tuesday that the Treasurer will demonstrate not only a sensitivity but also a realistic logical approach to this matter, as he has done in the past.

FUNDING FOR EDUCATION

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, I have another question for the Premier. He will recall, when he left the Education portfolio a decade or so ago, that the education share of the budget was some 23 per cent. Even acknowledging that there have been declining enrolments, it now constitutes some 14.6 per cent of the provincial budget.

The Premier will be aware that the entire thrust of the new directions in education, such as the reports of the secondary education review project, OSIS, or Ontario Schools Intermediate and Senior divisions, and a variety of other new proposals that presumably will be statutorily enshrined and will oblige the school boards to do a variety of things, are going to cost a great deal of money.

He is also aware that the financial effects of Bill 82 are putting real pressure on the school boards and that, for example, the 3,000 or 4,000 new French classes we will require are going to cost a great deal of money.

How can the Premier reconcile these two divergent approaches? On the one hand he is cutting back funding in real terms, and on the other hand he is demanding more of the school boards. How is the Premier going to explain to the boards how they are going to fund these new programs?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am always intrigued by the approach of the Leader of the Opposition, who will take up an issue if he senses there is some political mileage inherent therein. At the same time, I will predict with total accuracy that when he gets on the news as he rushes out of here on Tuesday at six o'clock, he will say the government should be spending less and should have a lower deficit at the same time as he comes in here and tells us that in program after program we should be spending more. I will give 11-to-two odds that is exactly

what he will do. He has done it every year he has been here.

Mr. Bradley: We'll settle for an answer; never mind the 11 to two.

Mr. Peterson: Is there anything the Premier would like to say about my tie while he is up on his feet? I will tell him what I am going to say. I am going to tell him to sell Suncor and cut the outrageous expenditure on his advertising. He should spend money appropriately for a change. Why is he cheating kids when he has money to spend constantly on his own aggrandizement over there?

The Deputy Speaker: The question being?

Mr. Peterson: It is his priorities that are screwed up over there, that is the Premier's problem, and I will say the same then as I am saying now. Now, does he want to answer the question?

He is aware, now the figures will come out, that the provincial share of education now has fallen below 50 per cent from 60 per cent or so some five or seven years ago. The incredible pressures the government is putting on the school boards, and thereby the municipal taxpayers, is creating a crisis in funding in the educational system. What is the Premier's approach to that?

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member may find, if he analyses it very carefully, that there is the odd school board in Ontario with a budgetary surplus. I know that will come as a great shock to him and will be contrary to what he is suggesting. He may find that. He should get his researchers to use that public money he talks about to analyse it just a shade more closely. The member for Quinte (Mr. O'Neil) is smiling, because he happens to know I am telling the truth.

Mr. Sweeney: He is smiling in disbelief.

Mr. O'Neil: I will not even comment on that.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I certainly was right in the first instance. He was smiling. He cannot deny that.

Mr. Sweeney: In absolute disbelief.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I say to the member for Kitchener-Wilmot (Mr. Sweeney)—

Mr. Bradley: Call him to order.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member should tell his colleague to be quiet; and he might do the same himself.

The Deputy Speaker: Yes, there is something to that.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I was saying to the Leader of the Opposition that if he looks historically at the level of—

Mr. Mancini: We can see now why you didn't go.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I just say to the member for Essex South (Mr. Mancini) that without a leader we are doing substantially better than his national party. And with his present leader, we are doing an awful lot better in this province than they are. I may even tell him a bit more about that later this afternoon.

Historically we have been over 50 per cent in some years, no question. This year it will probably emerge at 49 plus some per cent of the cost. I say to the member from St. Catharines (Mr. Bradley), who likes to interject, if he also includes in that figure the amount—which is a legitimate educational expense—that goes into the contribution by Ontario to the very valid area of teacher superannuation, with which he will be very familiar, and the amount of money that is allocated in terms of property tax credits for the educational levy that relates to the school board expenditure, he will find that on average we are well above 50 per cent.

I also say to the member that while the school boards of this province do have additional responsibilities, I think it is fair to state that if he calculates the expenditure per student related to many competing jurisdictions in terms of salaries for our elementary and secondary school teachers—and I say to him to please go back to what he said about them as a professional group not too long ago—it will be sensed that in terms of priority, or as a sense of total public expenditure, the elementary and secondary school systems are being well served.

There is no question there are some pressures; however, we are all dealing with pressures in terms of public expenditure, and I think the contribution of the province to the school system this year will enable it to provide a high level of educational service; a level that, with great respect, is not equalled anywhere else in this country.

Mr. Allen: Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, that is not the message we are getting from teachers and those who are closest to students. In 1943 Premier Drew promised to maintain provincial funding at 50 per cent. It took 27 years for this province to achieve that and now it is backing away from it. The Premier assures us

that given the new initiatives his government paints with a beautiful red brush, Bill 82—

Mr. Sheppard: Blue.

Mr. Allen: I'm sorry; it is blue, blue is the order of the day today.

Mr. T. P. Reid: The ones who are not here are wearing black.

Mr. Allen: In any case, regardless of colour, there are two new major initiatives out there, Bill 82 and the Renewal of Secondary Education report. We know that will cost a lot more money if either of those projects is going to be done decently.

Will the Premier assure us that the money will be in place to ensure adequate funding to put special education into the classrooms and to satisfactorily reorder the secondary curriculum, so it will be meaningful and not simply a hollow sham?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I could not hear for the interjections from some members of the honourable member's own party. He referred to—

Mr. Martel: We were talking about the coronation that didn't happen.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, no; I could not hear the member for some of the things some of his colleagues were saying. I understand—

Mr. Swart: If you listened you would do a lot better.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh no; the member from Welland (Mr. Swart) has only to whisper and we are inundated.

Can I say to the honourable member that I heard him refer to the one report. What was the second report?

Mr. Wildman: The ROSE report.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member means the secondary education review project report.

Can I suggest, with respect, that whatever reorganization may take place within the secondary school system, I do not think it is inherent in any reorganization or alteration that it necessarily requires substantial increases in the amount of funding. In my own mind, I do not think I have ever been able necessarily to equate quality in education with the amount of money that is allocated. I think that is a bit of mythology which the member should take a careful look at.

2:20 p.m.

I assure the member that we are committed to special education. I have made that statement a

dozen times in the past 21 or so years in this Legislature. But I also suggest to the teachers who come to the member with their concerns, and I appreciate they are genuine, that in terms of the amount of funding, the priority that has been given and the traditional approach to education in this province, our teachers and our students are being well served. I say that without fear of contradiction.

I give the member an opportunity to show me statistically how they are being better served in any other part of Canada or, quite frankly, in any part of the United States. Even in California they do not do as well.

Mr. Bradley: Mr. Speaker, I think the Premier recognizes that all members of the House are pleased we have Bill 82 and commend the efforts of his government in that regard, as well as for the initiatives in terms of French-language education.

Will the Premier give a commitment to the House that money will not be taken from other essential areas of education to pay for the implementation of Bill 82 and other initiatives that flow from OSIS?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, as far as the general legislative grants are concerned we certainly will not be taking money from other important or, as the honourable member phrases it, essential areas of education. But there is not just a responsibility upon government but also, and I say this with respect, a modest responsibility upon the local school boards, which have democratically elected individuals and competent and relatively well-paid professionals at the head of their systems, to organize their priorities to see what efficiencies they can create within the school system.

While I suggest they have done a certain measure of this, and I do not quarrel with it, I think there are still some areas where greater creativity can be shown, such as in the area of administration, perhaps in the numbers of people involved, so the dollars—which are scarce, and no one is going to argue with that—can be appropriately spent. That includes special education.

EXTENDICARE LTD.

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Health (Mr. Grossman), I would like to address a question to the Premier.

Can he explain why the Ministry of Health approved a contract between Queensway General Hospital and Extendicare Ltd.? That contract gives ownership of a chronic care unit of

120 beds to a private, profit firm called Extendicare, in exchange for which the provincial government and the taxpayers of this province will be providing that private, profit institution with capital funding of \$2.2 million, operating revenues well in excess of \$400,000 a month and private and semi-private fees, as well as user fees, at a rate, for private and semi-private fees, that has been described by an official of the Ministry of Health as whatever the traffic will bear.

How can the Premier possibly justify that kind of approval and that kind of a project when it simply means the taxpayers of this province are handing over large chunks of money to private, profit medicine in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I guess there is a philosophical difference between this party and that of the leader of the New Democratic Party. Profit over here is not an ugly word. I know it is with him. I understand that. I do not agree with it.

If he will trace the history of the involvement with Queensway, he will find it was initiated by the board of Queensway General Hospital, a group of people who represent that community. They are a group of people who have had some success, in my view, in administering that hospital. They came to the government with this proposal. It is not a new principle and it is not unique. We have seen many hospitals contracting out requirements for laundry services and things of that nature.

There is no question that, in terms of the assessment of the Queensway General Hospital board and in terms of the economics, this is an excellent way to go. I know it offends the honourable member philosophically but if the level of care is there, and we agree it will be, if economically it is as efficient as other ways of funding extended care or chronic care facilities, why should the leader of the third party be reluctant to see whether this pilot project will create greater efficiencies within the health care system? What is so offensive to him?

Mr. Rae: What is offensive is that we are squandering taxpayers' dollars and handing them over to private, profit individuals. The Premier says there is a philosophical difference between our two parties. He is quite right. He and his party believe health care is a commodity that should be sold to the highest bidder, and we in our party find this view offensive to the notion that health care is a right for every citizen.

In that regard, since the Premier brought up the question of contracting out and the activi-

ties of the Ministry of Health, does he really think it is appropriate that the Ministry of Health should be contracting out the ownership and operation of large-scale operations to private companies whose senior executives, in the case of Extendicare and AMI (Canada) Ltd., are former senior officials of the Ministry of Health itself? Does he not think this kind of relationship and this kind of contracting out is totally inappropriate in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I must confess to the member that I am not familiar with the senior executives of Extendicare at all. I do not even know who they are. But I think, if memory serves me correctly, he may find that the same sort of operation—maybe even the same company—was doing some of the same kind of service work in Saskatchewan under the leadership of his former friend and colleague Premier Blakeney.

Ms. Copps: Mr. Speaker, when the Premier says the discussion with Extendicare was entirely—

Mr. Hennessy: Louder, louder.

Ms. Copps: Does my friend want it louder? I will give it to him louder.

When the Premier says the discussion was a discussion between the board at Queensway hospital and Extendicare, can he explain to me why I spoke with a member of the institutional planning division of the Ministry of Health last year and was told that the discussions with Queensway were under way, and when we called the administrator of Queensway to get information about the project, he stated: "Don't ask me; ask Larry Grossman. I have been working on this deal for eight months and I am not about to blow it now"?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I haven't the foggiest idea.

Mr. Rae: Truer words have never been spoken by the Premier.

Since I gather from the Premier's earlier answer that not only does he not find these contracts and this trend in the province offensive but also it is a trend he favours, I wonder whether he can comment on a remark that was made by the vice-president of AMI, who said: "We have done our homework. We are anxious to move forward just as other situations arise. We think we have a big future in Ontario. We are focusing on Ontario for our achievement list." Similar statements were made by Extendicare in its annual report for 1982 in the sense that it sees this as the beginning of a trend in Ontario.

Can the Premier give us an assurance today

that no more hospitals and no more chronic care units will be turned over to private, profit medicine for use of a private and semi-private user fee system in Ontario? Can he also give us an assurance that this tendency to demolish accessibility and universality in Ontario with respect to health care finally will be brought to an end?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I say to the member, don't get so excited, eh? The first part of his question he already asked last week to somebody. I can recall that—

Mr. Martel: He didn't get an answer.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Listen, he used exactly the same quotation.

Mr. Rae: I didn't get an answer.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I just thought I would remind him that I heard the same question last week to one of the ministers, and a very excellent answer.

I cannot speak with the same knowledge about the arrangement at Hawkesbury hospital. They did not speak to me. I am familiar, not with the details but with what the Queensway hospital board is developing. They came to see me. I directed them to the Ministry of Health. I think the ministry has already said this is not a trend; it is a project the government has supported. We want to see how effective it is, how efficient it is, the standard of care. We are relatively confident that the assessment the Queensway hospital board has made in its desire to initiate this project will turn out to be correct.

The member's suggestion that we are turning over the entire hospital system in this province to private entrepreneurs is totally erroneous. Do not get carried away. Do not exaggerate the problem. Leave room for a little creativity. Leave room for a little entrepreneurship that may be more efficient and may even provide a better level of health care. Do not get so excited about it.

2:30 p.m.

Mr. Rae: The so-called nursing home industry in this province is a monument to the Tory government's commitment to private, profit medicine in Ontario and the Premier knows it.

DEATH OF GARY GUILBEAULT

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour. It concerns the tragic death of a young man named Gary Guilbeault, who was only 24 years old, in an accident on April 26 in the Stanleigh mine at Elliot Lake. I am sure the minister knows about this accident.

There was a very strong feeling on the part of the union health and safety committee that this was an accident that could have been avoided. Mr. Guilbeault was hit by a ventilation door that came down on him as he was driving a scoop tram through. Thirty general ventilation orders with respect to the ventilation system were issued last year and four have been issued so far this year, on February 7 and 28, March 10 and April 22.

Can the minister give the House the categorical assurance that none of the orders involved could have affected the safety of this individual? Can he explain why so many orders have been issued over the past while? As the minister knows, 1,700 orders were issued against Rio Algom and Denison Mines last year. Can the minister tell us why that number of orders has been required? Can he give us the assurance that nothing could have been done to avoid the tragic death of Gary Guilbeault at Elliot Lake?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, the leader of the third party raises an excellent point. It is one I looked into on a personal basis as soon as I learned about this tragic accident.

It is my understanding that Mr. Guilbeault was driving in second gear when company policy requires driving in first gear. Apparently he did not stop to activate the switch but pulled the switch on the run.

We are trying to investigate this completely and also to look at the training and supervision aspects of the operation. I am expecting a complete report on that in the very near future.

Mr. Rae: I would like to tell the minister that the union has yet to receive the accident investigation report from the Ministry of Labour. They would appreciate receiving a copy of it.

Our information from both witness and company reports is that the alternator belt on the scoop tram was broken, the headlights were not working properly and, perhaps most important, Mr. Guilbeault was not licensed to run a 320 scoop tram. The fact that he was not licensed had not been checked by his supervisor. That is the information we have. Could the minister report back to the House with respect to that?

If the ministry had policies with respect to refusal on a group basis when a union feels an operation is unsafe, such as were recommended by my colleague the member for Sudbury East (Mr. Martel) in his ground-breaking report entitled, *Not Yet Healthy, Not Yet Safe*, does the minister not feel that kind of measure would have given the union the ability to protect the

life of Gary Guilbeault when it felt it needed that right?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: In response to the first part of the member's question, I believe when I answered originally I stated we were looking at two aspects of the company operation: first, whether or not he was properly trained; and second, whether or not he was properly supervised. We are looking at the very points the member has raised and I indicated that right at the beginning.

As far as the suggestion the honourable member is putting forward, it is something we will simply have to take a look at.

Mr. Wildman: Mr. Speaker, I hope the minister looks at it very seriously, because if the recommendation of my colleague from Sudbury East had been implemented, perhaps Gary Guilbeault would still be alive today.

Is the minister aware the Atomic Energy Control Board has recognized the danger of the ventilation doors but has refused to deal with that in its regulations, arguing it is a matter of conventional health and safety and is therefore up to the provincial authorities? This again raises the federal-provincial jurisdictional dispute that has bedeviled regulation of health and safety for uranium miners for far too long.

Is he now prepared to accede to the requests made by the union and order the installation of audio and visual warning devices on these doors? If he is not because of the jurisdictional dispute, is he prepared to get out of the field of health and safety for uranium mines altogether?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member brings up a good point. We have been holding ongoing negotiations with the federal government, with the mining industry and with the unions as to whether we should get out and turn those responsibilities over to the federal government.

We have found great reluctance on the part of the industry for us to do that. We have found some reluctance on the part of the unions for us to do that. Yet the federal government is telling us it feels it should be taking over those responsibilities. We are attempting to come to grips with that.

Mr. Martel: Four years.

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: I agree it has been far too long. I do not disagree whatsoever and I wish I could bring it to a satisfactory resolution. In the meantime, while we are trying to make the necessary arrangements with the federal government, I will not apologize for the calibre of

the inspectors or the calibre of the inspections being done by the personnel of the mine safety branch of the Ministry of Labour.

EXTRA BILLING

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond further to a question raised with me on Monday by the member for Bellwoods (Mr. McClellan) concerning the continued treatment of Debbie Sutherland.

As I promised, I discussed this matter with the Deputy Minister of Health and with the acting minister, the member for Eglinton (Mr. McMurtry). We are pleased that since her birth Debbie has been able and will continue to be able to receive this unique treatment within the Ontario health care system. However, we do not believe patients or their parents should be faced with the unbearable debt to pay for necessary medical treatment in the public hospitals of Ontario.

I have asked the deputy minister to contact the Ontario Medical Association and ask it to review this entire matter in the light of the repeated assurances of the medical profession that opting out does not restrict access to medicare or place undue financial burdens on those with limited income.

Regarding the unpaid portion of the medical bills, the Ontario health insurance plan schedule of benefits has a provision under independent consideration. This provides flexibility when considering situations such as this, under which the experts in the medical field, as well as the Ministry of Health, can determine whether unique situations such as Debbie Sutherland's would warrant special consideration for funding.

I will review this further with the Minister of Health (Mr. Grossman) when he returns and ask him to report to the House.

Mr. McClellan: Mr. Speaker, if I understand the minister correctly, and I hope I am not putting too uncharitable a cast on it, the Ministry of Health will be going cap in hand to the Ontario Medical Association on behalf of the Sutherland family and, in effect, begging for charity.

I would like to ask the provincial secretary if she is aware that the stupendous volume of opted-out claims in this province—which now amounts to three million claims a year, 8,219 opted-out claims each and every day of the year—means there are many cases of severe financial hardship, the majority of which are specialist opted-out claims? It is totally preposterous for her government to be in the position

of trying to deal with these on a case-by-case basis. Even if it is able to solve the Sutherland case, and it has not yet solved it, it cannot possibly solve all the cases of hardship created by this level of opting out.

2:40 p.m.

The Deputy Speaker: The question is?

Mr. McClellan: When are they going to put an end to opting out and extra billing?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I would suggest the member address that question to the Minister of Health when he returns. At this time, there is no indication the government will be issuing any such kind of regulation.

Ms. Capps: Mr. Speaker, will the provincial secretary make a commitment to table in the Legislature the response of the Ontario Medical Association to the question?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Mr. Speaker, I will leave that consideration to the Minister of Health.

SALFORD LANDFILL SITE

Mr. Elston: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of the Environment. As he will recall, on December 22, 1982, the joint board under the Consolidated Hearings Act made a decision on the Salford landfill question. Has the minister now come to a decision as to whether he supports that decision of the joint board?

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, as I am sure the member knows, there is an appeal which is currently before cabinet on that decision or flowing from that decision. As is routinely the case, an appeal has been circulated I believe to all parties and they have had an opportunity to respond. Among those, of course, would be my ministry, but any response that has been submitted would be a part of a cabinet submission and I would not be free to divulge the specific contents of any such submission to cabinet.

The matter will be dealt with by cabinet in due course and the decision will be made known to the member and others then.

Mr. Elston: The minister will realize the hearing that was held under the Consolidated Hearings Act went on for quite some time. There is a great deal of expense on the part of the interveners. There is a great deal of expense on the part of the proponents who, as I understand it, were under the care and guidance of the ministry. As a result of that, a great deal of technical information was passed in front of the board.

As a result of the technical nature of that hearing, that whole process, does the minister not feel it is probably not appropriate that the cabinet intervene to press its decision on top of a decision that was made by a fully qualified board under legislation which was sponsored in the past by this government?

Hon. Mr. Norton: Obviously when cabinet considers an appeal from any tribunal from which an appeal to cabinet flows, it considers very seriously and very carefully all aspects of the matter before it. This matter would be no different.

WELFARE PAYMENTS

Mr. R. F. Johnston: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Treasurer. The Treasurer will be well aware that the high welfare levels have caused great hardship for municipalities around Ontario because of the burden on the property tax. I presume he is also aware that the Association of Municipalities of Ontario has a group that is now studying some alternatives to this particular format we have at the moment for dealing with welfare payments.

Will the minister in his budget, or around the time of his budget, be making a statement which will indicate a percentage reduction in the amount of money that would be coming from the property tax base? Or will he be announcing a number of direct grants to a select group of municipalities which he decides have been sufficiently hard hit to warrant some bailing out but not without touching the basic structural inequity at all?

The Deputy Speaker: Before the response, there seem to be an awful lot of private conversations taking place in the assembly. I am wondering if all members would co-operate, so we might hear the, I am sure, eloquent answer from the Treasurer.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Absolutely eloquent.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, the two ministers most commonly involved with the problem—the ministers of Community and Social Services (Mr. Drea) and Municipal Affairs and Housing (Mr. Bennett)—have also been monitoring the situation. Obviously I cannot make any commitment as to what is or is not in my budget; obviously, however, there has been concern. I believe the member will find answers from a number of ministers from way back on this issue saying there would or could be assistance programs for municipalities which are having a problem raising the money.

On average, the load has not significantly increased the mill rate, but on average it does not allow for the specific communities with real difficulties. I have to depend upon advice from them, as the member can understand, before determining which communities are involved or what assistance programs might be beneficial.

Mr. Wildman: Mr. Speaker, is the minister not aware that the reason the mill rate has not been affected in many communities such as Sault Ste. Marie, which is facing a 45 per cent increase in its welfare costs this year as more and more exhaustees come off unemployment insurance benefits, is that those municipalities such as the Sault have cut back on their other services, especially the roads budgets and other projects they would normally be spending on this year, and that means extra costs in the near future?

Can he confirm that the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing will be making an announcement of ad hoc grants to some of these municipalities in the near future? If that is true, what are the criteria that will determine which municipalities will get special assistance and which will not?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, no, I cannot confirm anything at this moment, and in fact I would point out that while there has been a growing general welfare assistance load in most municipalities, such as Metro Toronto, I believe it was just a couple of days ago that Metro said for the first time in quite a few months that the trend line had reversed. It was too early to say it was definite. However, when one looks at cities such as Windsor and Sudbury, where I believe employment has improved lately—

Interjection.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Sudbury has recently improved in employment.

Mr. Martel: It hasn't in the Sault, though. There are 2,200 guys not going back to work at all.

Hon. F. S. Miller: No, it has not in the Sault. I quite accept the fact. The trend lines may be improving. The other thing I would point out to my friend from the north is that one of the great beauties of municipal government is that they do have some flexibility in programs. It is a very wise thing to allow that flexibility. That does not mean we have not a provincial one. We have never denied that.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Mr. Speaker, does the Treasurer not recall that he already put an extra burden on the municipalities with the expansion

of the seven per cent provincial sales tax? Besides that, is he not aware that his colleague has not been increasing the unconditional grant as compared to the conditional grant and that municipalities do not have the flexibility or the ability to make those kinds of decisions that the Treasurer is indicating? The government again has let the municipalities down in doing exactly what it had promised would be done in years past.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, if my friend's comments are correct, then why is the burden of municipal taxation a lower percentage of family income today than it was five years ago?

HOSPITAL BEDS

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, the member for Ottawa South and the senior minister for Ottawa-Carleton. For 10 years, he has been a minister in this cabinet and for 10 years we have experienced a shortage of acute care hospital beds in Ottawa-Carleton.

Can the member, as a senior minister, tell the people of Ottawa-Carleton when we are going to get additional acute care beds, in view of the fact that we now have not a political but an objective report from the Ottawa-Carleton Regional District Health Council?

This indicates that instead of making progress over the past 10 years, we have been going backwards. We are now short 214 adult acute care hospital beds for Ottawa-Carleton. In the meantime, we are having a situation where people cannot get into certain hospitals. We are having difficulty treating cancer patients and so on. What can he say to the people of Ottawa-Carleton to solve this very serious problem?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, first, I have had the opportunity of meeting with the members of the hospital planning council in Ottawa and reviewing with them some of the statistics in that report. In questioning the report, they were not quite sure of some of the bases it happens to be derived from.

2:50 p.m.

The question should really be directed to the Minister of Health (Mr. Grossman), but I am delighted to have an opportunity to answer because I have met with them and have gone through some of the aspects of that report.

I think it would be fairer to say that some of the criticisms the member has levelled at this government for not having some of the provisions for heart treatment and so on have been

answered by one of the most outstanding doctors in the community—indeed, if not in the province and the country—in the field of heart surgery, and that is Dr. Keon. He very clearly indicates that this government has gone an extremely long way in bringing on stream later this year, some time in the month of September, a relatively large number of units, or beds, for the treatment of heart patients.

Indeed, I asked the hospital planning council in the Ottawa-Carleton area one very straightforward question, "Are you indicating clearly to me that people cannot derive emergency service at all of the institutions in that general geographic area of our province?" That statement is not sustained or upheld by the hospital planning council. They know very well that the capacity is there to look after emergency cases. Where selective surgery is involved, there are sometimes delays in getting that surgery completed.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, the minister quoted from that great surgeon Dr. Keon, and that is the only thing I agree with him about: that he is a great surgeon.

But here is what Dr. Keon said just a very few weeks ago about Mrs. Henriette Renaud, who died because she could not be admitted to the cardiac unit: "But in this case there is just no excuse. She waited seven days, and if we had got her a few days before, even four or five hours before, she probably would be alive today." The reason he did not get her—and he is quoted as saying this—is that he did not have adequate beds.

The minister is well aware that the committee he met with has indicated the necessity is for active hospital acute care beds.

Mr. Rotenberg: Question.

Mr. Roy: Yes, I am coming along. I know it is very sensitive out there because the situation in Ottawa-Carleton is embarrassing.

The committee the minister met with has indicated that the occupancy rate for Ottawa-Carleton is the highest in the province, and what is necessary is more active or acute care beds.

Instead of just voicing generalities, will the minister and his colleague the member for Ottawa West (Mr. Baetz) or the member for Carleton-Grenville (Mr. Sterling), on behalf of their colleagues in cabinet, advise the people of Ottawa-Carleton when we will get additional acute care beds so that patients can get normal treatment in Ottawa-Carleton, as they do in the rest of the province?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Instead of trying to grandstand, the member for Ottawa East should look at the situation in its very clearest form. Indeed, he should read through the entire remarks of Dr. Keon, who recognizes the fact that the individual to whom the member refers should have been admitted to the hospital in advance; but that is a decision of that hospital, not of this government.

I question anyone who will tell me that in the great part of this province, eastern Ontario, the hospitals and the administrations of those hospitals are not responsive to emergency cases. If the member is saying they lack the intelligence, the understanding and the appreciation of emergency cases, I doubt very much that he understands the service of hospitals at all.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, when hospitals are pressed to the wall because of the shortage of resources to provide beds, they are going to be forced into making decisions they will regret, but they will be forced into them by the government.

Is it the policy of the government of Ontario, in addition to keeping a lower ratio of hospital beds to population in eastern Ontario than in any other part of the province, that more than 10 per cent of those beds will have to be taken up with chronic care patients? If not, what action will the minister take to ensure that there is space outside of acute care beds for chronic patients so that the acute care beds can be used for emergency needs?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, I have responded to the member for Ottawa East; I would suggest that the question of the member for Ottawa Centre is similar and I will refer any further questioning or answers on that to the Minister of Health.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR WOMEN

Ms. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour with regard to the government's goal, announced in 1980, to achieve 30 per cent representation of women in all modules and categories in the public service by the year 2000. I draw attention to an alarming statement in the introduction to the recently issued report of the women crown employees' office for 1981-82 which seems to indicate a backing away—

The Deputy Speaker: Order. I am sorry to interrupt the honourable member. I hate doing this but actually I am having trouble hearing the question. I wonder if all honourable members

might be so kind as to keep their quiet conversations quiet.

Ms. Bryden: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The comment in the women crown employees' office report for 1981-82 which alarms me and seems to indicate a backing away from the 30 per cent goal is as follows: "The result of this examination was an agreement that the specific goal of 30 per cent representation by women in all modules and categories may not be realistic in some categories and that the goal and methodology be re-examined." They are referring to an examination by the Provincial Auditor and the public accounts committee of the operation of the office.

Does the minister agree that both the goal and the methodology need to be re-examined? Does he feel such a modest goal as 30 per cent representation to be achieved 17 years hence is unrealistic, particularly in view of the opportunities his ministry and the government have to change the atmosphere and to increase the supply of qualified women and the openings to which they may apply?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, I agree with the honourable member. I think the goal of 30 per cent is the one we should be working towards. That is what we are attempting to achieve. In fact, that report also indicates that in the past year which the report covers there was improved representation in nine out of the 10 under-represented modules or categories. In the 10th, which was a technical module, the women maintained their representation. That is an indication of definite progress.

Ms. Bryden: Is the minister aware the criticism of the Provincial Auditor was directed to some specific categories involving technical and legal positions? What are the minister's plans to improve the opportunities for training women in these fields? Also, what are his plans to improve the projection techniques for vacancies in these fields?

The public accounts committee recommended both those procedures should be re-examined to see what programs can be developed for training qualified women and for improving the projections.

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: I agree with the recommendation that they should be re-examined and that is what is going on at the present time.

Mr. Wrye: Mr. Speaker, is the minister not concerned that while there was an overall increase noted in the report the increase in women's representation in the executive cate-

gory in the past year was, I believe, only from 6.3 per cent to 6.9 per cent, a total of only 44 women in that category?

Has the minister's staff any studies that may have been done, and can he share them with us, to indicate whether the narrowing of the wage gap by 1.6 per cent as reported in that report was due more to large increases negotiated in collective agreements within the civil service than to any affirmative action by his own ministry?

3 p.m.

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, I am delighted the honourable member brought up the decrease in the wage gap by 1.6 per cent, because that is the most significant decrease we have had in any single year. We are proud of that and I am convinced it has been because of the affirmative action program.

In respect to the other part of the member's question, I just had a conversation yesterday with my colleague the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Pope). He was telling me very proudly, as well he should, of some executive changes involving women in his ministry.

He has a woman assistant deputy minister and there are now two or three regional directors who are women. That is certainly a breakthrough in that particular ministry, and the same thing is happening across government. This is particularly a breakthrough at a time when there has been a virtual freeze on employment and so on. All of the movement within the civil service is of an internal nature.

EMPLOYEES' PURCHASE OF PLANT

Mr. Van Horne: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Industry and Trade regarding yet another company closing in the province. Given the response of his colleague, the Minister of Labour (Mr. Ramsay), to a request for assistance to employees to purchase a plant about to close that he would do everything he could to persuade the company to arrange for the possibility of a buy-out by its employees, and given the minister's response to a request for legislation requiring companies first to make an offer to employees to purchase a plant about to close which was a flat "no," I would like to ask the minister if he still holds the same view in light of the imminent closing of a company on his own home turf in London, Ontario, PPG Industries; would he consider assistance in this and other cases to help employees buy companies which are about to close?

Hon. Mr. Walker: Mr. Speaker, I have indi-

cated I am not prepared to see a law passed, and I do not think the member is prepared to see a law passed, that would oblige a company to sell out. In some cases it might not be in the interests of the company to do that. We have to realize they have a right to determine the approach they take to the business and who they might sell to. They have the right to not sell and this might sometimes work to their competitive advantage. Examples of this have come up in recent times.

However, I have agreed to use whatever persuasion my good offices could be to a company, in this case one from Hamilton, to try and be part of that process. I may say we did, to no avail. At least we made an attempt at it and I am prepared to do that in other cases.

I am told of other examples where we have been successful in encouraging an operation to sell to the employees. We are prepared to be a part of it. Indeed, the member might raise the matter with his colleague the member for Kitchener-Wilmot (Mr. Sweeney): in that riding, there is a company with which we are actively playing a role in encouraging a sell-out arrangement to the employees. We will try and do that wherever possible. If we are advised of the situation, wherever it is, we will certainly tackle it.

PETITIONS

START CENTRE

Mr. McNeil: Mr. Speaker, I would like to present a petition containing over 3,450 signatures opposed to the proposed closing of the St. Thomas Adult Rehabilitation and Training Centre.

MCCARTHY'S SANDBLASTING

Ms. Capps: Mr. Speaker, I have a petition for the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Norton): We the undersigned residents of Lake Avenue North and Lake Avenue South, Barlake Avenue, Eastview Avenue, etc., wish to call to your attention the flagrant violation of rules and regulations concerning the health and welfare of all citizens in this area, particularly the children in schools and playgrounds, by McCarthy's Sandblasting, 255 Lake Avenue North. There is a long explanation which I will forego. There are 20 signatures attached to this petition.

REPORT

STANDING COMMITTEE ON REGULATIONS AND OTHER STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS

Mr. Kerr from the standing committee on

regulations and other statutory instruments presented the following report and moved its adoption:

Your committee begs to report the following bill with a certain amendment:

Bill Pr4, An Act respecting the Missionary Church Canada East.

Your committee begs to report the following bills without amendment:

Bill Pr8, An Act to revive Dave Holliday Limited.

Bill Pr10, An Act to revive Thunder Bay United Church Camps Incorporated.

Bill Pr11, An Act to revive Thomas-Hamilton-Webber Limited.

Bill Pr16, An Act to revive Coptic Orthodox Patriarchate of Alexandria, the Church of the Virgin Mary and St. Athanasius.

Your committee recommends that the fees, less the actual cost of printing, be remitted on the following:

Bill Pr4, An Act respecting the Missionary Church Canada East.

Bill Pr10, An Act to revive Thunder Bay United Church Camps Incorporated.

Bill Pr16, An Act to revive Coptic Orthodox Patriarchate of Alexandria, the Church of the Virgin Mary and St. Athanasius.

MOTION

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BUSINESS

Hon. Mr. Wells moved that, notwithstanding standing order 64(d), Mr. Lane and Mr. Dean shall exchange positions in the order of consideration of private members' public business.

Motion agreed to.

INTRODUCTION OF BILL

WORKERS' COMPENSATION AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Haggerty moved, seconded by Mr. Mancini, first reading of Bill 30, An Act to amend the Workers' Compensation Act.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Haggerty: Mr. Speaker, the explanatory note says: "The purpose of the bill is to broaden the criteria used by the Workers' Compensation Board in assessing the impairment of earning capacity resulting from an injury that causes permanent disability. The act currently states that the impairment of earning capacity shall be estimated from the nature and degree of the

injury. The board is authorized under the act to compile a rating schedule of percentages of impairment of earning capacity for specified injuries that may be used as a guide in determining the compensation payable in permanent disability cases. The bill repeals the provision that authorizes the board to compile a rating schedule and directs the board to estimate the impairment of earning capacity in the light of all the other circumstances of each individual case."

ORDERS OF THE DAY

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE (concluded)

Resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

Mr. Foulds: Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate to the House that we will be moving a further amendment to the amendment to the speech from the throne. As soon as the final delicate wording of that arrives in the House we will be distributing it to the other two parties. I will be moving it at the end of this discourse.

3:10 p.m.

The speech from the throne was as vapid, as vague and as indecisive a document received in this Legislature as I have seen during the decade of this Premier's (Mr. Davis) administration. Considering the nature of throne speeches, this one reached new heights, new heights that gave indecision, procrastination and vagueness, always a hallmark of the this administration, a bad name.

Mr. Barlow: Does that mean you didn't understand it?

Mr. Foulds: No. What it means, for my honourable friend in the back benches of the Tory party, is there was nothing there to understand. What it means is it was, as the great American novelist Faulkner would say, quoting Shakespeare, "A tale told by an idiot, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing."

Mr. Barlow: I'm sorry I asked.

Mr. Foulds: I'm sure you are.

My personal view is never have people been so disillusioned with their governments, either provincial or federal, and never since the 1930s have the people of the province looked for and desired decisive leadership that contains at least some hint of vision.

Here in Ontario in the last eight weeks, the

whole government seems to have been on hold while the Premier made up his mind about whether or not he would run for the federal leadership of the Conservative Party. Will-he Davis or Won't-he Davis: will he run or won't he?

To paraphrase a commentator in Thunder Bay yesterday, Arthur Black: "After the Premier danced his dance of the seven veils, what do we get? We got Premier William Davis revealed in a pale blue body stocking." The central question was: could a vacuum replace a vacuum? The answer came a resounding "yes." The Premier succeeded himself here in the Ontario Legislature.

What we need in this province is leadership, not mere generalship from behind relying on the safety of public opinion polls, relying on the safety of ad hoc decisions that just might get us out of difficult times temporarily.

What we have seen in the last few months, and it was typified by the speech from the throne, is a government in disarray, a government at war among themselves: The minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Bernier) opposing the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Pope); and the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry) frozen in incompetence, indecision and lack of action over a number of major public policy questions, whether they had to do with the Norcen affair, so clearly outlined by my colleague the member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick), or whether they had to do with the tragic events at the Hospital for Sick Children.

Leadership does not mean waiting forever to hear what the polls tell you about everything from the Darlington nuclear station to the province's increasingly artificial bicentennial project. Leadership does not mean waiting forever while the Big Blue Machine takes its polls and tells one whether or not one has a sure thing going into the federal leadership race—or should I say suicide gamble?

What has happened over the last 10 years in this province is that underneath the politics of blandness in Ontario there has begun to emerge, unfortunately, the politics of meanness, the politics of pettiness, the politics of bread and circuses and the politics of absolutely no substance.

This administration has led us from the great expectations of the 1960s, the great hopes of our province and our country at that time to the acknowledged hard times of the 1980s. When the annals of history come to be written of this administration, it will indeed be condemned for

its lack of vision, lack of courage and lack of imagination. It will be praised for some political astuteness and shrewdness. It will be praised wherever men praise and revere indecision, public manipulation and procrastination.

Let me quote a couple of paragraphs from this year's speech from the throne:

"Ontario is now emerging from a period that has proven to be difficult for all jurisdictions within the industrial western world. The economic setbacks experienced in 1982 were, beyond doubt, more severe than any public or private observers had foreseen. For the first time since 1975, real output for the industrialized world's economies as a whole declined; and, more disturbing, unemployment rose to unprecedented post-war heights. Clearly, steps must be taken to overcome this situation."

Further on, it says, "The personal economic outlook for many Ontarians, however, will remain challenging." There indeed is a misuse of words if I have ever heard one. Challenging indeed: how can it be challenging when many of those people have no hope of a job?

To go on with the quotation: "My government is well aware of the hardships imposed by high levels of unemployment. These hardships have been borne by men and women in all regions and from all walks of life. The lessening of these difficulties will continue to head the list of matters requiring the full attention of this Legislature."

So far, so good, even if vague. However, as is typical of this administration, here comes the cruncher, the disclaimer, the washing of hands, the abdication of responsibility.

In the next paragraph it says: "It is obvious that no single province has at its disposal the means to solve all of the problems resulting from current economic conditions. However, the government of Ontario"—get this, Mr. Speaker—"will continue to give the highest priority towards the fashioning of initiatives designed to provide badly needed job opportunities."

Let me repeat that just in case anybody missed it, "The government of Ontario will continue to give the highest priority towards the fashioning of initiatives designed to provide badly needed job opportunities."

What the blazes does that mean? In very simple language it means this government has no idea how to create jobs. It means the Premier's and the government's writers and advisers will sit down to fashion words, slides and advertising to try to make things look good.

Actually, that particular sentence elevates verbal qualification to new heights. It may be the first sentence I have ever read that has four qualifying verbs between the subject and the object.

We in the New Democratic Party lack confidence in this government. That should come as no surprise. We think this government has failed dismally the people of Ontario.

It has failed the farmers of this province in view of the number of farm bankruptcies just this spring. When the Canadian Farmers' Survival Association is driven to the action it has taken, and has received the attention it has, it is because the farmers of this province simply have not received the attention and the leadership they expect and deserve from this government.

3:20 p.m.

When the residents from remote northern communities experience the price discrimination they do, as outlined so ably by my colleague the member for Lake Nipigon (Mr. Stokes), and when a relatively stable and large town such as Marathon is barely saved from the precipice of disaster by the closing of their mill, it is obvious that over the decade of this administration they have not received the leadership from this government that they expect and deserve.

When the elderly of this province face extra billing for medical services, and when they face a lack of housing, chronic care, extended care and nursing home beds, it is obvious they have not received the leadership they expect and deserve from this government.

When we have youth unemployment at an unprecedented high rate, I suggest the youth unemployment question is not merely a question of unemployment, not merely a question of job creation but a question that will divide, badger and bedevil this society unless it is remedied, so that social ills in this province will see an unprecedented unfortunate outcome unless they are remedied.

When married young people who require housing cannot afford it, even though there is housing stock they cannot afford on the market, it is obvious they are not getting the leadership they deserve and expect from this government.

When school boards are mandated to provide special education programs; when the Ministry of Community and Social Services, which has been covering some of those programs, has announced that it will no longer provide this funding; when the Ministry of Education will no longer provide that funding and throws it back

on to the local school boards; when the municipalities of this province are obliged to provide ever-increasing general welfare assistance by the province; and when we have the province, on the other hand, steadily reducing its share of the costs of these programs, it is obvious the school boards, the municipalities and the people they represent are not receiving the leadership they deserve and have expected from this Conservative government.

My colleague the member for Scarborough West (Mr. R. F. Johnston) demonstrated the other day that people all over this province are seeking and desperately want work. All of us in our constituency offices across the province have experienced similar cases of a very real, heartbreaking and touching nature. I do not know how a government can sit on those benches across the way, in the face of the kind of evidence they have been and must be receiving from their own back-benchers and from the letters that were received by my colleague the member for Scarborough West, and show such complacency, indecision and sheer vague vapidity.

It is obvious that the unemployed, and the unemployed who are in the most tragic situation, those whose unemployment insurance benefits have been exhausted, are not receiving the leadership they deserve and expect from this provincial government.

When my colleague the member for Sudbury East (Mr. Martel) heads a task force on occupational health and safety and, after very careful and thorough examination over the course of a year, comes to the conclusion the Ministry of Labour is failing to enforce the act in literally hundreds if not thousands of instances, it is obvious the workers of this province who are working are not getting the leadership they expect and deserve.

As one witness before that task force put it so graphically, "If the provincial police were to enforce the highway speed limits in the same manner as the Ministry of Labour enforces the Occupational Health and Safety Act, then the only thing on the highways doing less than 150 miles an hour would be a jogger."

The government in this province has given us absolutely no economic leadership in the past year. It has given us little in the past 10 years.

I would for the moment like to turn to some so-called federal initiatives, those initiatives that were greeted so warmly by this Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) initially and by many people initially. In the past 10 days or so, there has been

an erosion and a realization that Marc Lalonde's budget was not what it was initially cracked up to be.

I suppose the best thing one can say about it is the reason it looks so good in the first place is that it was preceded by Allan MacEachen's two disasters. If one thinks back far enough, there was John Crosbie's fiscal suicide before that. At a time when Canada's unemployed were expecting a new deal, they were given a raw deal by Mr. Lalonde.

Although it is couched in the language of economic recovery, there is little in the Liberal budget that alleviates the suffering of the unemployed or the insecurity of working Canadians. The federal budget is wrong-headed. The private sector has made it clear that high debt loads and excess capacity have put the brakes on any hope for an investment-led recovery. The Liberals, however, have ignored these facts and gone ahead to strengthen those same tax expenditures which have failed to create jobs in the past.

When 40 per cent of the manufacturing capacity of Ontario, for example, is not being used, how does anyone expect industry to invest in building new capacity? Recent studies have shown Canada's very generous tax incentives in research and development have failed to entice industry into investing in research and development in Canada. In fact, shamefully, only Ireland and Iceland spend less on research and development than is spent in Canada.

The failure of the Lalonde budget has provided the Ontario Treasurer with a responsibility and the opportunity to assist directly the unemployed of Ontario. But we have had no hint, either from the speech from the throne or more recently, that that will be the case.

The Treasurer has been so preoccupied in the past with investment giveaways that he must now concentrate his attention and Ontario's financial resources on job creation and economic stimulation. His budget should contain a major housing initiative. It must create direct jobs through investment in the health care system, in environmental control and in the major industrial sectors.

The Lalonde budget has given investors in the private sector more than enough room to manoeuvre. The Treasurer's budget has to provide those same opportunities for our youth, for our farmers, for our consumers and for the unemployed in Ontario.

The recession has produced a job crisis, pure and simple. There are three quarters of a million

unemployed in Ontario. Our youth and our women seek to take their place in our economic life, but their hope is fading. The human cost of this recession is measured in the despair of young graduates looking for their first job, of people in their most productive years suddenly forced into idleness and in older workers cast aside and in fear of never finding another job.

3:30 p.m.

Economists in the *Globe and Mail* Report on Business and in the *Financial Post* can talk all they like about economic recovery, but until the unemployed have the dignity and security of a job, the recession remains a recession, if not a depression.

The recession is not even-handed. The government is not accurate when it tries to imply that it has affected men and women equally in all sectors and in all regions of the province. It has affected them deeply but not equally. It affects women workers more than men. It affects the young and less experienced slightly more than others. It increases the ranks of the poor relative to the rich.

Without disregarding the influence of the 1980 oil price shock or the real, ongoing shifts of manufacturing to low-wage countries by the multinational corporations, the prime responsibility for the rate, depth and extent of this recession lies with the government's monetarist experiment, and a cruel experiment it has turned out to be.

The response of conservative governments, whether they be called Liberal, Conservative or PC, to the economic crisis has been cutback and retrenchment. Social programs are suffering. Thousands of the unemployed are in danger of exhausting their unemployment benefits, and the six and five or nine and five public wage restraints have further strangled the sick economy while discriminating against specific workers and trampling on collective bargaining rights.

One of the side effects of the government's wage restraint program on public service workers is coming to my attention more and more from small businessmen in my community. They have people coming into their stores, looking at furniture or appliances and saying, "I really would like to buy a new refrigerator because mine is 10 or 15 years old but, because the government has cut back on my wages, I cannot afford it this year." That is what they say to small businessmen in my community.

It is not just trampling on a small segment of our society. The ripple effect of that trampling on a segment of our society is beginning to be

felt by the whole economy. Simply put, we in the New Democratic Party believe strongly that government action, direct and indirect, is required to dig our way out of the situation.

What is the one single economic initiative this government can take credit for over the past year? There is only one. With the help of their Liberal partners here in slavishly following the Liberal lead in Ottawa, they brought in wage controls on public service employees. These are public service employees all across this province; not merely those working with the provincial government but those working for municipalities, school boards, nursing homes, hospitals, universities, schools and all those institutions that provide needed and necessary services for the citizens of Ontario.

This government brought in those controls in September 1982. That was supposed to be the big initiative to get the economy back on the tracks, to get the Ontario economy working again. Has the program succeeded? Has Ontario's economy picked up since last fall? Has the cutback in government spending, the ripping up of contracts, the keeping the lid on the wages of these employees created employment in Ontario? It has not created one single job.

When the program was announced, the unemployment situation was something like this. There were 689,000 out of work in Ontario. Of the women in the Ontario work force, 11.2 per cent were out of work. We had a youth unemployment rate of 16.1 per cent. Let us look at a few randomly selected cities across the province. Thunder Bay, which was one of the best off, had an unemployment rate of 10.1 per cent. St. Catharines and Niagara Falls had unemployment rates of 12.4 per cent. Hamilton had an unemployment rate of 13.1 per cent. Sudbury, the mining capital of Ontario and once the mining capital of the world, had an unemployment rate of 26.9 per cent.

When the government introduced its legislation, I said those figures were scandalous. What are they today, after eight months of those wage controls? The unemployment rate for Ontario is higher at 11.4 per cent. In Thunder Bay it is higher at 14.5 per cent. In St. Catharines and Niagara it is higher at 17 per cent. In Hamilton it is higher at 15.7 per cent. In Sudbury, believe it or not, it is even higher at 27.1 per cent. All those figures have been exceeded in the intervening eight months at some point.

The government's single economic action, the one initiative it took to put the economy back on the road, has not helped our most

crucial problem in this deep and abiding recession, the problem of unemployment, one little bit. Furthermore, unemployment for women increased to 11.9 per cent and unemployment for youth skyrocketed to 22.2 per cent. How can we get across to this government, which is largely absent this afternoon, that remedying the unemployment line is far more important than the bottom line?

Finally, the real number of unemployed in the province has jumped in the eight months since September by almost 100,000 to 782,000. That demonstrates just how the Davis government has failed in this past year.

Let us look briefly at the Davis decade. In April 1971 the speech from the throne, the first of the Davis government, contained this statement; I quote directly: "The current unconscionable levels of unemployment which have been forced upon the Canadian people will be combated with every means at the disposal of this provincial government. The budget will be presented on April 26. Its purpose will be to restore the inherent vitality of our economy."

What were the "current unconscionable levels of unemployment which have been forced upon the Canadian people" in April 1971? In our province, it was 6.1 per cent, with the number of unemployed at 192,000. Youth unemployment was still high but, at 11.5 per cent, about half of today's figure. Unemployment of women in the work force was at 5.3 per cent, less than half of today's figure.

What took place in individual cities across the province, in the same cities I compared for the period from September to this month? We went back and looked. The statistics are not exactly parallel, because there has been some minor adjustment of the way Statscan reports, but in the figures we can compare there has been an adjustment of only about 0.2 per cent at the very best.

In Thunder Bay unemployment was at 7.1 per cent, about half of today's figure. In St. Catharines it was at 5.9 per cent, less than half of today's figure. In Hamilton it was at 6.7 per cent, less than half of today's figure. Mr. Speaker, just take a guess at what unemployment in Sudbury was in April 1971. You were in the Legislature in 1971. You were elected in 1971 for the first time. Unemployment was 5.6 per cent. Unemployment in Sudbury was at one fifth of what it is today.

So much for the Premier's vision of the north; so much for diversifying the economy of the

largest one-industry town in northern Ontario, let alone the many other one-industry towns.

3:40 p.m.

If those figures were unconscionable, to use the government's phrase in 1971, what can we say about today's rate of unemployment? What can we say about this government, because every one of those figures represents human beings in every region of this province? We can only say that today's unemployment figures display the moral, economic, social and human bankruptcy of this government.

The Davis decade has led us from the great expectations of the 1960s to the hard times of the 1980s. If the creation of a powerful economy, an exciting society, full employment and a place for all our people to stand requires resources, skilled workers and a sound infrastructure, we have all of those here in Ontario. What we do not have is a government that has the guts and is willing to take a hand to put all of these things together and provide the lead for a growing and prosperous economy. What we have is a government that believes in the law of the economic jungle of meanness and of leanness.

At this time I want to put forward a number of proposals for creating jobs. The proposals, quite frankly, will require some deficit financing, but that deficit financing will be a productive deficit and a deficit designed specifically to put people back to work. It will not be the kind of deficit this government has engaged in during the 10 years of the Premier's stewardship, investing in stupid and exotic government spending from the white elephant of Minaki Lodge to the self-serving \$40 million in advocacy advertising of this government.

The Premier's government may not have bankrupted this province fiscally, but it has bankrupted this province of its hope and its future and it is dangerously close to bankrupting this province of its faith in itself.

This government's deficit is no more stimulative, no more genuine than the deficit of the federal Liberal government. In fact, the kind of deficit financing that both these levels of government have carried on goes to show that the Premier should not have been seeking or considering the leadership of the Progressive Conservative Party at the federal level. He should be pondering the leadership of the Liberal Party at the federal level, and perhaps that is what he is holding off for.

I believe the people of this province and the province itself will fight back. I believe the people of this province will work to make this a

place, as the prayer at the opening of this Legislature says every day, "where prosperity reigns and justice prevails," particularly where economic justice prevails. It is economic justice this party has put on the front burner. It is economic justice that we will fight for every day of this sitting of the Legislature.

Prosperity and justice will prevail if the people of this province get the leadership they desire and need. We in the New Democratic Party make no bones about it. We are prepared to accept that leadership. We are prepared to take direct government action and direct government intervention in the economy of this province at any time to help the working men and women and the unemployed people of this province.

We are prepared to work in co-operation with industry, business, small business and the workers of this province. Only by developing a co-operative sense of the future, a co-operative sense of ownership and a co-operative sense of our own strength will we turn this economy around. It is no good to pit one segment of society against another as this government has done by its nine and five per cent wage program. It is no good to victimize the victims of recession as this government has done with social services, with the unemployed and with the throwing of economic costs back on local school boards and municipalities.

It is increasingly apparent that the recovery, which has been welcomed with such relief by the Liberals and Conservatives, is a profit recovery, not a job recovery. The true nature of the recovery is there for anyone to see in last month's Liberal budget projections. Those projections expect unemployment of more than 12 per cent in 1983, more than 11 per cent in 1984 and more than 10 per cent through 1985 and 1986.

What happened to the unconscionable level of unemployment in 1971 of 6.1 per cent? We are going to get back to those unconscionable levels of 6.1 per cent only if we have the guts to aim for full employment and to start some direct intervention in the economy now. Recovery is a meaningless term in the face of continuing high unemployment.

There is no recovery for the 176 Ontario farmers who went into bankruptcy in 1982. There is no recovery for the additional 47 farmers who lost their farms to creditors in the first quarter of 1983. There is precious little recovery for the workers in Sudbury, Hamilton and Sault Ste. Marie, in Brantford, Chatham,

Windsor, the Niagara Peninsula and in eastern Ontario, where the recession has meant unemployment rates of 15 to 27 per cent.

The recovery is a cruel joke to the thousands of employable people in Ontario who have exhausted their unemployment claims and have been forced on to the welfare rolls.

What must be done immediately is to restore the conditions under which consumer spending will resume, jobs will be created and necessary investment will be undertaken, and under which social services and health services must be not only maintained but also strengthened. In the face of the inability of the private sector to provide those jobs, and the incomes so desperately needed for the economic recovery in Ontario, government must act. There is a good deal that can be done and an NDP government would do it.

An unemployment recovery program must respond to cyclical, seasonal and structural unemployment. This means harmonizing a range of policies to promote economic development and community wellbeing. My friend and colleague the member for Windsor-Riverside (Mr. Cooke) will be outlining those policies and strategies in detail in his response to the budget to be presented by the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) next Tuesday. However, I would like to comment and outline some of the highlights.

The policies must include general spending and taxation policies that will provide the most efficient use of government supports for industrial development activity, the most effective direction of government expenditures, both direct and indirect, in relation to job creation. In other words, government expenditures should be job-intensive, and the most progressive kind of tax funding must be included in the government's program.

Second, when we build on public assets we are not simply throwing money away; we are investing in the future. When we build new schools, hospitals or health care clinics we are building for the future of this province; they are assets that this province and the communities of this province will enjoy for years to come. We must do that so the people of Ontario will continue to derive future benefits from current government spending. In other words, the kind of spending we are talking about is the kind of spending that will pay off in the future and not simply go up in a puff of smoke.

3:50 p.m.

We must build human resources. We must do that through career choices and through retrain-

ing opportunities, and career opportunities, if I may say so, should be not merely in the new high-tech areas but in some traditional job areas as well. We must support community initiatives; we must have direct job creation initiatives; we must have economic planning in public investment. Finally, we must have in many cases, particularly in the case of plant shutdowns, direct legislative intervention to give us protection.

Real economic recovery must begin with action to protect existing jobs. We have long argued for improvements in plant closing legislation to bring Canada into line with its European counterparts. Proposed plant closings should be subjected to public scrutiny, with an open-book examination of the company's operations. In any shutdown, workers should have the right of first refusal to purchase the operation, and government should support such initiatives via preferential financing terms.

We have found over the past year that many of the closings in this province have been closings of plants that were profitable or potentially profitable. It was "rationalization," and the rationalization sacrificed the Canadian worker and the Canadian branch plants. We have to get that kind of protection.

However, if a plant closing really is unavoidable, companies should provide and pay for retraining as well as encouraging and paying for early retirement. Severance pay obligations, pension provisions and collective bargaining rights must be strengthened to protect jobs in Ontario.

What follows is, very briefly, the kind of job creation program that we in this party believe in and believe in very strongly. We are proposing a \$2-billion, short-term employment program to create 150,000 jobs and a five-year, \$5-billion program to create 200,000 new jobs throughout Ontario. The program is creative and it is workable. It is principled but pragmatic. It is ambitious and it will cost some dollars, but I submit that it is fiscally responsible.

Youth unemployment is at a crisis level in Ontario. Our proposals would put at least 140,000 of our young people to work. They would increase the pool of skilled labour in our province so that those young people could continue to have jobs in their middle age and until their retirement.

Other proposals in the energy field, in agriculture, in the environmental sector and in the health and social service sector would create useful jobs and provide Ontario with services

and facilities that are needed now. These proposals, although they are short-term in the sense that they would create short-term jobs, are investments for today and tomorrow to give people experience and skill so they can become part of the permanent work force of Ontario and be pulled into a growing and developing economy.

In the longer term we are proposing a five-year program of industrial restructuring. That is what we need in this province; let us face it. Despite the claims that the economy has begun a fragile recovery, the private sector continues to dismantle productive capacity. Branch plants are closing down. Private sector reinvestment is falling short of necessary levels of retooling and product development. We must begin to implement an economic strategy for recovery based on the creation of permanent jobs, industrial restructuring, resource development and local and regional development.

Ontario imports more than \$35 billion worth of manufactured goods. If we replaced only 15 per cent by domestic products, 60,000 direct jobs could be created and many other jobs would be created by the spinoff activities. Whether it is auto parts, agricultural products, mining machinery or electronics, we have significant trade deficits. These deficits represent opportunities for jobs and industrial development. Government must undertake public investment today for tomorrow's jobs. Our five-year program is designed to take advantage of these opportunities in key sectors of Ontario's economy.

The talk, which is very disappointing, is about the recovery that is "under way." Catch phrases such as "increase in investor confidence" are supposed to indicate that the recession has bottomed out and that we are on our way to so-called sustained growth. However, when we have unemployment predictions that point to a continuing unemployment crisis, what we have is a government that has failed to come to terms with creating jobs. The Liberal budget projected unemployment at more than 12 per cent for the rest of this year, more than 11 per cent for 1984 and more than 10 per cent for 1985 and 1986. Very simply, we believe these figures are unacceptable.

I want to conclude by indicating that this speech from the throne has got to be the biggest non-event, the biggest pile of pap, the biggest abdication of authority, the biggest abdication of responsibility that even the Davis administra-

tion has engaged in during its whole decade; and that is saying a lot. As I have emphasized before, what the people of Ontario want is leadership, not abdication. What they want is hope, not despair. What they want is the understanding that jobs will be created now, not starting in 1985 or 1986.

What they want is a bicentennial that is really worth celebrating in 1984. One of the biggest and best bicentennial projects this government could bring in would be a massive job creation program all across this province. That is the kind of bicentennial project that would speak to all the groups in all the regions of this province, and that is the kind of bicentennial project this party would be delighted to implement and to support.

What the people of Ontario want is a government of substance, not a government of image. The people of Ontario are willing to pitch in. They are willing to bear their fair share of rebuilding this province and this economy, but they are no longer willing to be victimized by an insensitive, callous and floundering administration.

Because the speech from the throne fails in every conceivable way to come to grips with the major problem of our province, the problem of jobs, the problem of human need, the problem of decent housing, the problem of health care, this speech from the throne does not have our confidence. This government has given the people of Ontario not a glimmer of hope, not a glimmer of vision for the future direction of this province, and we in the New Democratic Party have absolutely no alternative but to vote against this government.

4 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Foulds moves, seconded by Mr. Rae, that the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor be amended by adding after the word "times" and before the words, "Therefore, this House declares its lack of confidence in the government," the following:

"And further, this House regrets that the provincial government has utterly failed to respond to the bankruptcy of Liberal government policies and has instead simply produced a vague and aimless speech worthy of liberalism itself rather than acting decisively to provide jobs, health and housing for Ontario's people."

Mr. Conway: Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure and an honour for me to wind up this throne speech debate on behalf of my Liberal colleagues.

At the outset of my remarks, as is customary, I would like to extend to you, Mr. Speaker, my very best wishes on the manner in which you are discharging your responsibilities in the chair. I think it is no secret for me to suggest we have had differences of opinion, but I like to believe we are growing together. I have been increasingly impressed by the way in which you are discharging the very difficult responsibilities that are yours.

As well, I would like to have you communicate those best wishes to your colleagues the member for Durham East (Mr. Cureatz) and the member for York Centre (Mr. Cousens).

Also at the outset of my remarks, I would like to offer a word of thanks to the good people of the Ottawa Valley and Renfrew North who continue to support me in most of my causes. I certainly enjoyed the legislative recess during which I had an excellent opportunity to travel about the hills and valleys of Renfrew county. I profited greatly from that opportunity.

I would like to turn my attention to the speech from the throne, which was read by the Lieutenant Governor in this place on Monday afternoon, April 18, 1983.

Given the recent events of this place and the politics of this province, I dare say upon rereading this particular speech from the throne on a number of occasions in preparation for this afternoon's reply that I have to think there was no more clear indicator than this speech from the throne that this was a government and a Premier (Mr. Davis) who truly have and had no plans to have any plans.

When one reads and rereads this speech from the throne, it is hard to imagine there was enough here to entice even Zena Cherry to this assembly on that sunny afternoon two or three weeks ago. One of my constituents to whom I offered the speech for reflection said it was "a tribute to longitude and platitude."

Before I turn to this tribute to longitude and platitude, I want to comment quickly upon much of the throne speech debate which it has been my pleasure to have heard over these past number of days. Once my leader asked me to prepare these remarks for the summary debate on our part, I must say I tried to listen to as many of the interveners as possible. In my humble estimation, I have to say that on balance the speeches in the debate on the throne speech were decidedly superior to the document itself.

I was disappointed, as were many of my colleagues on this side of the House and I dare say some on the government side, with the

efforts made by our ebullient friend the member for Sarnia (Mr. Brandt), the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Ramsay). Many of us imagine that the member for Sarnia has a considerable future in this place and I just wanted to share publicly my sense of disappointment at his leadoff. I know it was his first and it was credible but perhaps not to his usual standard.

One of my colleagues allowed as to how it was almost robotic. I thought perhaps that was a good word. Those of us who know the member for Sarnia know that he is a lively and engaging orator and he did not show those qualities as he marched methodically through a script which, dare I think it, might have been prepared elsewhere.

There were many serious and thoughtful and some entertaining speeches. To cite but some, I want to say in his absence to the member for Prince Edward-Lennox (Mr. J. A. Taylor) that his observations, reciting as he did some of the recent periodical literature that he had been reading in the *Atlantic Monthly*, I thought made a good speech. I thought he properly directed our attention to some of the very major structural changes that are taking place in the North American economy.

I thought the member for Carleton East (Mr. MacQuarrie) was very good in his discussion about technology transfer and what future lies ahead in that connection. I listened the other night with my friend the member for Ottawa East (Mr. Roy) to the histrionics of the member for High Park-Swansea (Mr. Shymko) who treated this House to, if nothing else, entertaining and elegant French.

I want to say as well that I read the speech of the government House leader, the member for Scarborough North (Mr. Wells), who seems to have taken his marching orders from Peter Oliver in his recent treatise on how the Conservative Party of Ontario has been much given to intervention, therefore one can live more easily with the trust company legislation and, dare I say it in the presence of my illustrious friend the member for Leeds (Mr. Runciman), the intervention in the oil business.

I did not want to go on at length about that but I thought the member in his comments about Ontario Hydro might do well to read some of the other literature, because it is not quite as Mr. Oliver would have one believe.

I want to say seriously that in my eight years here I have seldom heard as timely and as well prepared and as excellent a speech as I heard

from the House leader of the New Democratic Party, the member for Sudbury East (Mr. Martel). It was a long speech, but it was a speech I would recommend to the attention of every member. It deals, as many will know from being here and having heard it, with the issues of occupational health and safety. I say, as at least one member, it is a model of the kind of work that all of us should aspire to in our parliamentary responsibilities and I congratulate the member for Sudbury East for an excellent address on a very important subject.

I thought the intervention by the member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick) was exceptional, not only for what it told us about his views in terms of the Ontario Securities Commission but also for the fact that it was the first time in eight years that I ever heard the member for Riverdale read from beginning to end a speech in this place. I thought perhaps he had the night before been with myself and the Premier to a dinner with the Aga Khan, where the Aga Khan treated us to a script which was almost as methodical, and perhaps the Aga Khan left a very substantial impression with the member for Riverdale.

I want to say I thought the member for Hamilton Centre (Ms. Copps), my colleague the Liberal Health critic, did our side well and proud in her leadoff.

I thought the member for Prescott-Russell (Mr. Boudria), surveying as he did the hapless procurement policies of the Ontario government, was excellent.

I thought the member for Brandt-Oxford-Norfolk (Mr. Nixon) as he surveyed the current political environment in somewhat truncated form was also very entertaining.

I thought as well, as I always do, that the member for Kent-Elgin (Mr. McGuigan), as he takes us through the intricacies of agricultural philosophy and politics, presented this House with a very timely intervention.

I heard or read at least eight or 10 speeches that I think are a credit to this place. To reiterate what I said earlier, many of the responses in this debate have been vastly superior to the document read by His Honour some three weeks ago. Let me repeat, I cannot imagine a more clear indicator than this speech from the throne that neither this government nor its leader has any plans to have any plans.

4:10 p.m.

I agree entirely with the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Peterson) when he says that this throne speech "lacked vision, vitality. It is full of well-worn platitudes and rehashed promises." It

is hard not to agree as well with the leader of the New Democratic Party that in fact this throne speech "simply indicates to the people of Ontario that there is light at the end of the Tory gangplank."

I would like to digress for a moment. I would like to coin a phrase, and the leader of the New Democratic Party is very apt in that connection. I want to say in digression that there were a couple of observations in terms of the situation on the day of the Lieutenant Governor's address which I think deserve brief comment by me.

The seating plan was one. There was one small indicator in the seating plan that struck me as perhaps more than passingly important. I know the Office of the Premier fairly well organizes who sits where and who is invited and all of that. As I looked out over the distinguished heads of those gathered here on the floor and elsewhere, I thought of how many opportunities and how many places there were for government people to sit. I was struck to see over there in the middle of the floor Dr. E. E. Stewart cheek by jowl with Mr. Eddie Goodman, QC.

I thought it was interesting that of all the places in this chamber, of all the opportunities, the government's chief bureaucrat was cheek by jowl with the government's chief political aide, the Premier's chief political aide. Perhaps that tells us something of the neutrality of the Ontario public service, about which I have sometimes complained. There may be some opposite who will say, "Oh, just an overly suspicious opposition member."

Let me just say I am delighted the federal Tory leadership campaign is under way, because it has taken away from this place the former Deputy Minister of Tourism and Recreation, the former national director of the Progressive Conservative Party of Canada, Mr. John Laschinger, who while he was here in his senior public service function, I am told by very good sources within the confines of the Ontario bureaucracy, was not only running his department but was actively engaged in two leadership campaigns, one for the member for St. Andrew-St. Patrick (Mr. Grossman) provincially and another for the federal Conservative member for St. John's West.

I am pleased that the federal leadership campaign of the Progressive Conservative Party has taken away that esteemed former public servant to his more likely calling. But I thought too it was interesting in so far as just how neutral is the Ontario public service at its senior levels.

A quick word about television. It strikes me yet again how difficult it is for many of us to convince the government to bring an electronic Hansard to this place. I know there are discussions; I know there are debates; I know there are countless government members who decry the millions of dollars that might be involved.

But it strikes me, as I know it attracts itself to your fancy, Mr. Speaker, that on the two major government occasions, the speech from the throne and the budget, there is no difficulty; the government is more than a little bit interested in lending its heart and its soul and its resources to the electronic media. I think this Legislative Assembly, as an independent parliament for those of us who know or care, might think about extending those practices that we have here on the throne and on the budget.

I want to say that this speech from the throne is, of course, as the member for Port Arthur (Mr. Foulds) pointed out, directing our attention to the hoped-for economic recovery. Certainly the document is full of hopeful language in that connection. It cites a number of indicators. The consumer price index, we are told, is now roughly at half its level of two years ago. There is "moderation in the unit labour costs, which are a healthy sign for the economy. There is consumer confidence which has expanded to some degree."

The throne speech goes on in its very early pages to remind all of us that there really is not very much that any provincial government can do to materially assist the economic recovery of the nation as a whole.

I thought my friend the member for Kent-Elgin, who, I want to reiterate, is one of the most insightful people and politicians it has been my experience to have known, pointed to a very interesting fact in comparing this throne speech with earlier versions of same. The member, in his very excellent remarks of some days ago, noted with interest the almost complete lack of what the analysts call fed-bashing. They seem to have made up, but there were throne speeches in my time here that were full of, "It is all Ottawa's fault."

I think this speech is important for what it does not say in that connection and that fact struck my attention, as it did the attention of my colleague the member for Kent-Elgin.

I want to note in this connection that the throne speech indicates the Progressive Conservative government of Ontario applauds the recent appointment of the Macdonald federal royal commission on the economic union. On

page 7 it says, "While the recently established federal Royal Commission on Economic Union and Development Prospects for Canada was a welcome initiative" So it is interesting to note for the record that the Macdonald royal commission—complete, presumably, with its per diems—is thought of approvingly by the Ontario government.

Mr. Brandt: We didn't buy the whole package.

Mr. Conway: The member for Sarnia says they didn't buy the whole package. This is a government that will not talk too loudly about the per diems of that royal commission. If one were to survey the public accounts and do the proper arithmetic, Donald Macdonald may be a piker by comparison to what is paid out by the Ontario government.

Certainly we note that the government of Ontario calls out again to the Prime Minister of Canada to convene a first ministers' meeting on the economy at the earliest opportunity. Presumably that is the kind of initiative this government has in mind for economic rehabilitation.

I was pleased to see that the auto sector attracted the attention of the government; but I was surprised, with this paean of praise to protectionism in that sector, that the Premier did not treat us to his Lada speech, the one he gave in Ajax or Pickering two or three years ago. I think Hughie floated that once, the Premier read it and someone told him that perhaps it just was not as Mr. Segal had written it. We have never heard that speech again.

I know there are distinguished members in the gallery here, perhaps in the Canadian Press or others, who can refresh my memory, but I think we heard that Lada speech only once. Perhaps it had something to do with the fact that the only Lada I used to see in the legislative parking lot belonged to a former distinguished member of the executive council who shall, of course, remain nameless.

I want to read from the last paragraph of page 7 of the throne speech:

"For its part, the government of Ontario is resolved to bear its full share of responsibility and to continue to provide leadership in the weeks and months ahead. My ministers, therefore, in their several responsibilities, will be placing before you, in this session, components of a clearly defined three-part program.

"Measures will be introduced to contribute to an enduring economic recovery which will create the jobs necessary to allow all Ontarians to lead productive lives; to strengthen the management of the province's affairs and to

respond to the critical concerns and needs of Ontarians."

If I may digress for a moment, what, pray tell, could that mean, "to strengthen the management of the province's affairs"?

I would like to stop for a moment and talk a little bit about some of those things. My colleague the member for Rainy River (Mr. T. P. Reid) very excellently and not very many weeks ago produced a document that indicated just how vacant and how hollow the Board of Industrial Leadership and Development experience has been.

I draw to members' attention the very excellent speech made by the member for Rainy River as he took us through chapter and verse, step by step, of the two-year BILD experience. It is really extraordinary that this government imagines it as a comprehensive industrial strategy and economic recovery program.

I will try to be a little bipartisan here, if I can. I read the federal budget of the member for Outremont, Mr. Lalonde, a few weeks ago and I was struck by that part of his budget—I think it is called the economic recovery package, the \$4.5-billion grab bag of initiatives—

Mr. Stokes: It was \$4.8 billion, was it not, after the revision?

Mr. Conway: It was \$4.8 billion? Perhaps. It was several billion.

4:20 p.m.

I have to say to the member for Sarnia I think Mr. Lalonde has been reading provincial political papers in Ontario from the early days of 1981. In that federal Liberal budget of but days ago I think I see BILD II. I will look forward to seeing how it develops.

Mr. Brandt: You are putting some distance between you and your federal colleagues, aren't you?

Mr. Conway: As an objective observer of the political scene, I want to say to the member for Sarnia—who, unlike me, cannot say he has known but one political affiliation in his adult life—that while I am not perfect, I am less spotted in that connection than he.

In response to that second item, "to strengthen the management of the province's affairs," just last weekend I was struck by the ads that festoon most of the daily press, those great big, quarter-page or half-page ads, "Tax Grants for Seniors." There they were again. Let me just say that if the Premier and the Treasurer want to streamline the province's affairs they will reconsider that initiative. In talking this week to my constitu-

ency office in the great community of Pembroke, I find my constituency assistant is upset all over again about the number of seniors who continue to be confused by that program.

None of us here is in any way disposed to reduce assistance to the seniors in this province who require it. But if there ever was a boondoggle, the public accounts committee and others in this Legislature—I well remember my very distinguished colleague the member for Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry (Mr. Villeneuve) 18 months ago, in a discussion with the Deputy Minister of Revenue, relaying the frustration of a very capable constituency politician, and it really has not got any better.

Everyone knows that program has nothing to do with delivering assistance to seniors, but everything to do with the so-called visibility question, a cheque from the Premier at Queen's Park. If this province wants to do something about streamlining the management of its affairs, it might well start there.

My illustrious colleague and friend the member for St. Catharines (Mr. Bradley) has pointed out, as has my good friend the member for Wentworth North (Mr. Cunningham) and others in this caucus, the shame that this government continues to spend at such outrageous levels, millions more than ever before, on government advertising. My friend the member for Wentworth North supplied me with data to indicate that in 1981-82, a year after the election, the total advertising account in this province is \$40.3 million, almost double what it was four years earlier.

No wonder the Treasurer is so handicapped as he seeks to find funds for the social policy envelope. He would do well to listen to my friends the member for St. Catharines and the member for Wentworth North in reviewing that budgetary appropriation. He could start by scrapping that tax grant program and going back to the more efficient, more progressive tax credit scheme that was well accepted, well in place for many years and delivered much-needed assistance to the seniors in this province who required that kind of help.

Mr. Eakins: You did not need a hot-line number either.

Mr. Conway: You did not need a hot-line number, as my friend the member for Victoria-Haliburton points out. I do not know whether anybody in Burnt River, in Cobocok or in the great village of Haliburton, which sent some of its illustrious journalists here today, can get that hot line. Perhaps the member for Victoria-

Haliburton might confide in this House. In Pembroke, in Deep River or in Deux-Rivieres one cannot get that hot line at all.

If this government is serious about efficiency factors, that is a good place to start. There are thousands of senior citizens in this province who, this very week, are bewildered about what is going to happen to their much-sought-after assistance in the coming weeks.

From the point of view of myself and my colleagues, nothing concerns us more about this throne speech than the complete want of direction in terms of new initiatives in the area of job creation. He is not here right now, but my friend the member for Wellington-Dufferin-Peel (Mr. J. M. Johnson) the other night in an especially personal and poignant way pointed out just how close the trauma of unemployment cuts for most of us.

For those members not here the other night, the member for Wellington-Dufferin-Peel talked about family experience in that connection. I thought he made the point perhaps better than any of us. I would only hope that the member would at least privately confide in the leader of this government that this kind of platitude and this kind of empty shell does little or nothing for those now almost 750,000 young, middle-aged or older Ontarians looking for work and not able to find it.

In that connection, I point to the very excellent work done by my colleagues the member for Kitchener-Wilmot (Mr. Sweeney), the member for Essex South (Mr. Mancini) and the member for Prescott-Russell (Mr. Boudria) who, over a period of many months, worked very hard and travelled very far, often under circumstances that were not nearly as agreeable as those of our illustrious parliamentary assistant colleagues across the way, the ones who ride in a ministerial car or fly in the government's aircraft, while opposition critics find themselves somewhat less generously provided for.

The Sweeney task force report on youth unemployment, the Liberal task force on jobs for youth, is reading I would recommend to every member, including the member for London South (Mr. Walker) who has important responsibilities in this connection. I want to quote very quickly from some of the Sweeney task force update of March 1983.

"When the Liberal task force reported in June 1982, it noted that unemployment among those aged 15 to 24 was at 16.4 per cent, equal to 186,000 young people. By February 1983, scarcely eight months later, the numbers had increased

further to 20.4 per cent and 211,000 persons. The unemployment rate for those 24 and under is more than twice as high as the rate for those over that age."

This Liberal task force report also draws to our attention the incredible views of the lead minister in this respect, the Provincial Secretary for Social Development and member for Scarborough East (Mrs. Birch), who on one occasion allowed as to how students and young people were perhaps not nearly as aggrieved by these economic hard times as unemployed executives. From that kind of comment, can we take any solace at initiatives which are really going to mean anything for those 200,000-odd young Ontarians out of work, people spoken of, as I said earlier, by the member for Wellington-Dufferin-Peel.

The task force goes on to point out, for example: "In 1980-81, the province of Ontario spent \$58.80 on job creation per unemployed youth. This year, the ratio fell to \$45.28 per youth, a decrease of 23 per cent. In essence, available funding for youth programs has dropped by almost a quarter during exactly the period when young people are most in need of help.

"The situation is not likely to improve in the summer of 1983," says the Sweeney report. "With youth unemployment expected to be near 25 per cent, it would seem logical for the Ontario government to devote extra resources to combating the problem. Indications are that this will not occur. Funding for one of the three major summer programs has already been announced and, of course, that is the so-called summer Experience program. It is sharply down.

"Experience '83 will receive \$12 million, exactly the same amount as in 1982. By the government's own estimate, 300 fewer jobs will be created this year than last. From peak support of \$19.5 million in the Experience '79 program, where it created 13,610 jobs, the program this year will create something in the neighbourhood of 8,500 jobs.

What are we paying the member for Brantford (Mr. Gillies) for? He sat here the other night and offered great advice and what he and his superminister are doing. The young people of Brantford city and elsewhere in this province will judge this government by the record. The record of that particular Experience or youth employment initiative is clearly inadequate.

As the curve of youth unemployment rises sharply, the curve of Ontario government sup-

port drops commensurately. That is not what we consider to be an adequate response.

4:30 p.m.

My friend the member for Essex South pointed out the other day, in what I thought was a very good release, that one of the other programs, the Ontario youth employment program whereby the government subsidizes the hourly rate to \$1.45, was clearly something less than we had been led to believe. In 1982-83, although \$23.4 million was provided to the Ontario youth employment program by regular budgetary means, with a further \$7 million voted in supplementary appropriations, only \$24 million was actually spent. This government is not even spending the money this House appropriates for youth employment at a time when the requirements are everywhere.

I want to give the government credit. I think the summer Experience program and the Ontario youth employment program are essentially good programs. In some ways they are innovative. The fault we find with this government is it will not fund these good programs to anything like the levels required by the current economic exigencies. That I think is the shame, and that I think is how and why the promise of 1981 has not been kept to those 211,000 unemployed Ontarians, at least in the spring of 1983.

The Liberal task force and the update are excellent directions for this government to consider, and in terms of policy—I do not have time to read it all—the recommendations are several. They are practical. They deal with everything from student aid to the whole question of manpower retraining and a whole series of issues in between.

The record of this government is not particularly good. I was reminded when I looked through the throne speech that about three or four years ago the government in another throne speech announced that, in consideration of increasing obligations for manpower policy, it was going to restructure the Ministry of Labour and call it the ministry of labour and manpower. What has come of that?

All I heard at the time was there was an enormous fight between the then Minister of Labour, now the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Elgie), and the Minister of Colleges and Universities (Miss Stephenson). The members know who won that. They know who would win any combat involving the Minister of Education and Colleges and Universities. That commitment, of course, has fallen into the back corners of the

Deputy Premier's office. That says a lot about our expectations of these throne speeches.

As I travel across the length and breadth of the Ottawa Valley, there is nothing more compelling than the concern felt everywhere—in my own household, with younger brothers who are graduating from the educational establishments of this province, through to older people who are being thrown out of work for the first time in 35 or 40 years. This throne speech offers them nothing. This government, as my friend the member for Essex South pointed out, is not even spending the moneys this Legislature has appropriated in that regard.

I would like to say a brief word about agriculture, not because the subject deserves that since clearly it deserves a lot more, but I have never been prouder of the activities of any of my colleagues than I have been in recent days of my friend the member for Huron-Middlesex (Mr. Riddell) who, without exception, is the most knowledgeable, most articulate and most innovative farm leader in this place. I want to say, in his absence, that not many days ago my friend the member for Huron-Middlesex with my leader and the member for Huron-Bruce (Mr. Elston), in a tour of the western peninsula and in the great town of Wingham, outlined the kind of agricultural initiatives that we as a party see as absolutely central to the rehabilitation and recovery of that sector.

Briefly, we are all, including the member for Lincoln (Mr. Andrewes), aware that the Ontario farm adjustment assistance program, the so-called OFAAP program, has not delivered the kind of assistance we think it could or should. For example, we think its criteria should be relaxed in the lowering of the 10 per cent equity factor. We think as well there should be—the member for Lincoln nods his head and let him stand on the side of a tougher line with the farmers of this province—

Mr. Nixon: I can hear him nodding his head.

Mr. Conway: The member can hear him nodding his head. Well, I do not know about that, but we think OFAAP should be amended immediately to allow for the inclusion of many farmers who, under the current regime, cannot take advantage of its offering.

I note that of the \$80 million allocated to that program, the latest research would indicate something in the neighbourhood of only \$20 million has been spent. We believe, on the basis of our best data, there is a substantial amount of money available to distribute to a farm community which, in some areas, requires it very much.

Only days ago I met a delegation in my constituency office headed by the president of the Renfrew County Federation of Agriculture. They brought the needs of agriculture in rural eastern Ontario to my attention. I want to tell my friends the members for Algoma (Mr. Wildman), Lincoln (Mr. Andrewes) and elsewhere that the problems in eastern Ontario are not often the same as they are in the more prosperous reaches of perhaps Brant county or Kent and Elgin. We have farmers who are more marginal. They need assistance that can be delivered by a more relaxed interpretation of the rules of OFAAP.

We think the time has come for this government to deliver on a young farmers' credit assistance program, a long-term credit assistance program. It is true, as my friend from Brant would say if he were on his feet, that for years this long-term credit program has been announced and promised to young people in this province. It is repeated again in this document.

Mr. Nixon: I was a young farmer when the government started it.

Mr. Conway: Exactly. The member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk (Mr. Nixon) was a young farmer.

Mr. Nixon: I was too late.

Mr. Conway: We say to the member for Don Mills (Mr. Timbrell), the putative Premier of the dying days of the Conservative dynasty, where is the program? It has been offered many times before.

I say the member for Huron-Middlesex has devised a farm strategy that incorporates real and meaningful assistance to young and middle-aged farmers that will deal with many of the current problems that can be addressed.

I say again, we take note of the fact this government has an \$80-million appropriation but to this day it has spent only \$18 million. Again, as we pointed out on the Ontario youth employment program, it is absolutely pointless to put money into those programs and then not spend it. We do not see any problems of expenditure when it comes to its enthusiasm for advertising.* Undoubtedly, and invariably, it goes over budget.

Mr. Ruston: There is more there.

Mr. Conway: Certainly, as the member for Essex North (Mr. Ruston) points out, there is lots of time and money for advertising but it appears that for OFAAP, for the young farmers' long-term credit, there is decidedly less enthusiasm to spend the money.

In the remaining moments I want to talk

about two issues that are of interest to me. I will touch upon them briefly.

I note in the throne speech there is a paean of praise to the women of this province. I will not go on reading that part of the throne speech which invites our attention to the important role that 52 per cent of the population of Ontario, which is female, is playing. It is 52.4 per cent of our population, according to page 14 of the document.

I want to say now in the presence of my good friend and party leader, the member for London Centre (Mr. Peterson), there are two initiatives which this government could take now to deliver the kind of assistance that would alleviate critical difficulties for women, particularly older women, in one category at least.

It is not good enough to appoint the Premier's former press secretary to the chairmanship of the Ontario Status of Women Council and think it has done a good job. Boy, did I chuckle the other day when I heard Sally Barnes thought the two pages and four paragraphs in this document were quite appropriate, thank you. Can one imagine that? I know Sally fairly well. I rather like her. I certainly respect her. But as the cutting edge of independent analysis in this province on women's issues, she is hardly that.

I want to say the Leader of the Opposition in this Legislature has put on the floor of this House two specific initiatives which could do something for women. One is not to appoint the recycled Deputy Premier (Mr. Welch) into some high chair of judgement on women's issues. Clearly, that is an indication of absolute and abject bankruptcy in terms of government policy.

I thought it was interesting in this connection that a few years ago we had a throne speech, I think it was 1978, where we were told that the Ministry of Labour—that was about the same time it was getting the manpower responsibilities—was going to play the lead role. This throne speech indicates a want of confidence in the capacity of that junior ministry to do anything meaningful.

4:40 p.m.

The Leader of the Opposition a year ago, and in one other case two years ago, put on the floor of this chamber two specific initiatives I want to touch upon briefly. I will read his resolution of a year ago. It stands in the name of the member for London Centre.

"That, in the opinion of this House, the government move without further delay to deal with the immediate and urgent needs of senior

citizens, particularly the single elderly, by increasing the level of Gains payment to bring their incomes up to at least 60 per cent of the income level of a married couple in order that they might better be able to maintain a more adequate standard of living and thus a more dignified lifestyle, and implement other much-needed reforms to our pension system, including dropping its veto of the child-rearing drop-out provision to the Canada pension plan."

The government often asks the opposition, with justification, "What are you for?" The Leader of the Opposition has put before the government of Ontario two practical, necessary initiatives that will deliver much-needed help to women in this province. Let the Premier of this province stand in his place moments from now and say to the Leader of the Opposition and the 52.4 per cent of our population that he is really serious about doing something in respect of women's issues, that he will move immediately to support the guaranteed annual income system enrichment along the lines of this resolution and that the government of Ontario will also withdraw its veto, the only veto left, of the child-rearing drop-out provision.

If the Premier of this province and his government want to give substance to these words, let him follow and let them follow the very able advice of the Leader of the Opposition, my colleague the member for London Centre.

I see the member for Brampton (Mr. Davis) arriving and I appreciate his attendance.

Very briefly, my colleagues in the caucus as well have proposed a program we believe would be an important stimulus to the housing sector. As a member from the hardwood hills of the Ottawa Valley, where the lumber industry is an important positive influence on the economic life and times of the 50,000-odd people it is my pleasure to represent, I want to say that, when the Leader of the Opposition proposed to the government of Ontario a \$145-million rental stimulation program that would encourage the construction of 15,000 units and create 26,000 person-years of employment directly, not to speak at all of the tens of thousands of man-hours of indirect employment, he tendered to the government of Ontario good, sensible, workable advice.

As I read the last pages of the throne speech, my eyes turned to the bicentennial. I do not want in the presence of more Loyalist types than I am to indulge in a great debate on that, but I was thinking of it last night as I watched the nightly news. I can imagine the summer and

early fall of 1984. I can see the landscape. The sun shines across this Edenic Ontario of ours, and in royal procession are the member for Brampton, the Queen of Canada, the Pope of Rome and Walter Borosa. I can see it now, and God only knows what George Gallup and Lou Harris will have to say when it is all over.

Interjections.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Robinson): Order.

Mr. Conway: I want to say in the presence of my colleague and sometime friend the member for Brampton that I am pleased he is here for the nine minutes of my remarks, because I have wanted to share with him brief observations about some of the more governmental aspects of his administration in recent days.

The member for Port Arthur (Mr. Foulds) anticipated some of my thoughts in this connection, and I will even use some of the same words. It has been my view, objective and dispassionate as it always is, that we have seen in recent months a government adrift and in many respects at war with itself.

My friend and colleague the Leader of the Opposition says this was a throne speech without vision, vigour or direction. I ask, is it any wonder, with the way the government, the executive council, has been behaving of late?

In the early days of the mid-1970s, at least in my experience here, the public disputes of members of the cabinet of Ontario were reasonably rare although often entertaining. Who among us can forget the day when the member for Ottawa South (Mr. Bennett), the then Minister of Industry and Tourism, allowed as how, with respect to the Edwardsburgh land assembly, his colleagues the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development or Housing, as it was at the time; Don Irvine, the member for Grenville-Dundas, and the former Treasurer, John White, must have "been off their nut to have bought the Edwardsburgh land assembly."

That was a reasonably rare occurrence. Now what are we treated to? A spectacle. I am going to recite quickly some of this. Mindful as I am, loyal British subject and all that, of the requirements of the British parliamentary tradition, the notion of responsible government, cabinet solidarity, common cause, and of course disagreements of a major kind on major issues, allow one the opportunity of resignation if there cannot be agreement.

What has the recent experience been? We have seen the Treasurer publicly disagree with the Premier on the issue of the government's single most significant initiative of this parlia-

ment, the purchase of Suncor. I will not embarrass the Treasurer with his public differences of opinion with the Minister of Industry and Trade (Mr. Walker)—

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I challenge the honourable member to verify there was any such public disagreement at any time. Many times there was agreement in this House.

Mr. Conway: I have speeches. I do not have time, but I will refer them to the Treasurer.

The Minister of Industry and Trade says government does not provide any real jobs and the Treasurer, responding to the Leader of the Opposition in the spring of 1982, talked about all the wonderful jobs he had been creating. I am only taking their public utterances at face value.

Much more interesting is the fact the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry), a man who has played a lead role in the constitutional debate, has publicly disagreed with the leader of the government on a critical policy question, namely the issue of the veto for Quebec. Not only has he disagreed with the Premier and the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Wells) but, after he was slapped, he got up and did it again. Days after he was scolded and rebuked by the government leader, a headline in the Ottawa paper *Le Droit* on February 8 said of him, "McMurtry ne cède pas." No concession from the Attorney General though the Premier enjoins him to join the government line.

I found it interesting as well that the government House leader, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and the Attorney General publicly disagree with the Premier on the issue of section 133. They have indicated different opinions on a variety of occasions.

I do not want to embarrass my good friend the member for York East (Mr. Elgie) but the public dispute between the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Elgie) and the Attorney General on the role of the Ontario Securities Commission and the publication of its various and sundry reports is a matter of record.

Clearly, the Attorney General, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing and the poor Minister of Tourism and Recreation, the member for Ottawa West (Mr. Baetz), have publicly different positions on the efficacy of municipal referenda on nuclear disarmament.

Of course, the Attorney General and his boss, the Provincial Secretary for Justice (Mr. Sterling), and the member from Timmins, the minister of natural disaster, the Minister of

Natural Resources (Mr. Pope), all have different positions in public on freedom of information.

We know the Attorney General and the Minister of Health (Mr. Grossman) have very different opinions on Bill 127 than the czarina of all education. We know the Minister of Education (Miss Stephenson) and the Minister of Health disagree almost completely on the business of medicare and I can imagine what she has been telling him about that latest regulatory change on the health disciplines matter of opting out. I can just hear them.

We know the member for St. George (Ms. Fish) publicly rebuked the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Ashe) on the question of equalized assessment.

We have seen the public disagreement of the Minister of Natural Resources and the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Bernier) on the whole question of the Indian fishing treaty. What did the Minister of Northern Affairs say? For any Politics 100 student this would be mind-blowing but, quoting the Minister of Northern Affairs, he said, "As the Premier would say, it is healthy that we have different points of view."

4:50 p.m.

Does that not say something for responsible government and cabinet solidarity? For example, we have seen the Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Drea) publicly disagree with my good friend the former Liberal spear-carrier in Elgin, the distinguished long-time member from the St. Thomas area. He says, quoting the St. Thomas newspaper of recent days about the minister's decision to close the St. Thomas Adult Rehabilitation and Training Centre in this fair town: "I don't know why the minister would want to close up a program that is working as well as START. Governments do some funny things sometimes."

We all know the Minister of Community and Social Services and the Minister of Health are not talking on group home policy. We know the Minister of Community and Social Services took a Parkdale initiative affecting the Minister of Health without even the minister's knowledge of what he was doing.

I will not go on to embarrass the Premier with the views of the member for Leeds (Mr. Runciman) on metric.

We have seen the Minister of Community and Social Services disagree fundamentally with the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Mr. Henderson). We know that the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development and the Minister of Community and Social

Services disagree on the agreement for rehabilitating the English Wabigoon communities.

I want to say to my friend the Premier, welcome home, welcome back. I am delighted he has returned here and that his fanciful voyage on the spaceship Challenger is now ended.

We have learned a lot in that intervening time. We know the former Conservative Prime Minister thinks he is a regional candidate. We know Norman Atkins has forgotten the campaign of 1971 and Allan Lawrence. It was mind-blowing to see Atkins on television lately with this effusive praise of a man about whom he felt somewhat differently about 11 or 12 years ago.

We hope the Treasurer's forecasting strength in terms of the budgetary policies in his charge are better than his knowledge of the Premier's intentions. The member for Ottawa West (Mr. Baetz) was quoted not long ago as saying, "I am 99.9 per cent sure that he'll go." Well, does that not prove what we have always thought about the member for Ottawa West? I have got to say in fairness to the Premier, I personally think one of the contributing causes in his staying here was 14 months of watching the leader of the NDP in this province and being determined not to repeat that mistake.

In conclusion, this is a government adrift, at war with itself, and we strongly encourage this House to vote with our amendment and turn to a new and fresh approach to the management of the public's affairs.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, it is always a difficult task to follow such an excellent speech and to use my limited persuasive powers to persuade the members opposite to support what the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Peterson), as he went through the receiving line after the delivering of that speech, said to His Honour: "Your Honour, that was a great speech and well delivered." He says his most realistic and objective things when he thinks he is in private and cannot be quoted. Except, I happened to be standing next to His Honour and I remember what he said.

I was unable, like the Leader of the Opposition, to hear all the comments of the leader-in-waiting of the Liberal Party as he wound up this traditional debate, and I apologize to the member for Port Arthur (Mr. Foulds), but I do have a few notes. I did get some of it from the speaker in my office, which interrupted another gathering, and I will say his speech was more interesting than the discussion I was having.

Mr. Renwick: There is a leader-in-waiting to your left.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would say to the senior citizen of the New Democratic Party, the member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick), as I said the other day, we would treat him with far greater respect and affection if he had been on this side. We would never have done that to him.

We have a feeling in our hearts for senior citizens. Not only do we have a feeling, we demonstrate it. If he decides to cross the floor of the House, I will put him on the front bench. It may be away at this end, it may be away at that end, but I assure him we will not kick him upstairs. If he brings his daughter with him, he is more welcome.

Mr. Conway: Failing that, there is always the municipal board for Kitchener.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, I have to say with that I just go by rumours. He teases us about one Mr. Rosenberg. I understand the other was at his leader's fund-raising dinner. I know it is not true.

An hon. member: He was at yours, too.

Mr. Nixon: All he needed was \$200.

Mr. T. P. Reid: He did not pay. He gave us an apartment, instead.

Hon. Mr. Davis: He is not confessing. When somebody told me that, I said the Liberal Party of Ontario would not have that gentleman at its dinner. Now, tell me I am right, that they did not. Tell me he was not there. I just cannot believe it. I guess I only assumed from the total lack of denial that—Is that why he did not mention the Rosenbergs in his address for the first time?

Mr. Conway: I was not aware that he was.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, he was not. There were so many there. I understand. It was a John Turner-for-leadership dinner. I understand why they were there.

Get out into the real world in Brampton, I would say to the member for Renfrew North (Mr. Conway). A well-advertised fund-raising dinner for the Liberal leader of Ontario and they had a phone booth with 39 people in attendance at the dinner.

An hon. member: There were free tickets.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Hope springs eternal.

Mr. Conway: How are you doing in Brant-Oxford-Norfolk?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I will tell you, we will get

more than 40, maybe not a whole lot more, but we will get more than 40.

Mr. Nixon: You cannot get more than 40.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, yes we can. I think we can.

Mr. T. P. Reid: There aren't that many derelicts or kids under nine there.

Mr. Gillies: No, they are all Liberals out there.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I was going to say to my good friend, it takes one to know one, but I would not say that to him. I am talking in a political sense. He is a political derelict when one comes down to it. He does not even confess to being a Liberal.

Mr. T. P. Reid: I represent all the people.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I dare him in the next election, if his wife lets him run, to use the words "community party" up where he is. It will not work. I forewarn him; it will not work.

Mr. T. P. Reid: I think we have heard that once somewhere before. Joe Clark tried that one.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I listened to a number of the observations and read some, and I guess the proper thing for me, sir, is to congratulate you, as have others, on the excellent way you are governing this House.

I was delighted to hear the leader-in-waiting of the Liberal Party make the same observations. I just hope he sticks to those over the next several weeks. I assure you, sir, I have made a note of them and I intend to remind him of them on the first occasion he gets up and says, "What I said then really did not apply to what I am saying today." But I will remember.

I also, of course, would like to thank the member for Sarnia (Mr. Brandt), the distinguished gentleman from that community giving such able representation, for his eloquent and excellent address in moving the throne speech itself, and of course to the—

Mr. Van Horne: You will find another way to reward him, in the fullness of time.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, of course, unlike the member's party, we earn what we get on this side of the House. We really do. How did he get up into the front row?

5 p.m.

I also want to thank the member for Parry Sound (Mr. Eves) for his excellent remarks and his contribution, and the members of the government who have participated in this debate. I

think it is fair to state that the members on this side of the House gave some focus to their comments and demonstrated some confidence in terms of the future of this province. They were not negative, carping or critical. They understood the realities of this province.

Mr. Conway: I heard the member for High Park (Mr. Shymko). I understood him too.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Has my friend read some from his members?

Mr. Martel: The Tory speakers were looking for cabinet posts.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I know what the member for Sudbury East is looking for, and I have done my best to accommodate; but he has failed every test.

I understand the Leader of the Opposition has a pressing engagement; I do not quarrel with that. But I offer this brief observation, because I have been in this House a shade longer than he has, a shade longer than most members of the House, and have watched the political process.

As the member from Sudbury once observed, this is not a tea party; we are not here to enjoy ourselves, although I must confess that I do enjoy myself on most occasions. But I am intrigued by the approach of the Leader of the Opposition. I hope the leader-in-waiting will convey this to him in a constructive sense.

I observed at the conclusion of the 1981 throne debate: "Not once was there a comprehensive, constructive policy enunciated by the Liberal Party of Ontario. That is one reason they are over there and we are over here." Nothing really has changed in that two-year period.

Mr. Nixon: You should have been in here listening to the last speech. You would have heard the alternative put forward very effectively by my colleague when you were having tea with your unwelcome visitors.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I never said my visitors were unwelcome, and I want to assure the honourable member that I was not having tea.

Mr. Nixon: I am not prepared to comment on what you were drinking.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I assure the member that I was consuming nothing. That will come as a surprise and disappointment to him, but in my office I am afraid that is sort of the tradition.

The Leader of the Opposition actually realized this fact on September 25 last year when he was addressing the members of his own party, the Ontario New Liberals, in London. He stated,

and I think he was right in this observation, "It is no accident that there is no longer a single provincial Liberal government today." That obviously was a very factual statement made by the Leader of the Opposition and one that reflects the malaise of that party, which has been a great party in this province.

At the same function in London, he urged young Liberals to be "agents of democratic revolution." I have to say to the acting leader of the party, that was not the impression the Leader of the Opposition created when he was interviewing the chairman of the board of Norcen on David Peterson's Ontario. Did the acting leader see that tape?

Mr. Conway: No.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No? I have some advice for him. As leader-in-waiting, he should have a look at that tape.

On Tuesday this week, I understand, the Leader of the Opposition, because he really did not have any relevant issue to raise since I was not here, said, "We are becoming a province without a Premier." I was not here Monday and Tuesday; I make no apologies for that fact. But I want the leader-in-waiting to convey to the Leader of the Opposition that I am going to be here as Premier. I guess the most disturbed persons yesterday at 10 minutes before one o'clock were the leader of the Liberal Party and the leader of the New Democratic Party of this province.

Another great quote was in the London Free Press again. The leader of the Liberal Party was quoted as saying: "Those guys, Tories, can do more after tea than I can do in a lifetime in opposition." Hallelujah! I agree with him. It is true.

He was quoted by the Canadian Press wire service—I just want to tell the members that I pay attention to what their leader tells me—on January 21, 1982, as stating, "Stupid policies will hurt this party in the future as they have in the past." I say, "Amen." It is true.

I have a lot more but I do not have time. I just suggest to the leader-in-waiting that in my political experience, while I have never had the responsibility of leading a party in opposition—

Mr. Martel: Is that why you wouldn't run federally?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, I gave it thought. I say very sincerely that there is great merit in attacking the policies of a government in power. That is the responsibility of an opposition party. But I also know there has been a growing

tendency to become very personal in terms of attacks on ministers.

I would ask the leader-in-waiting to talk to a law class at a faculty of law not too far distant from here and sense what its impressions were when the leader of his party attacked the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry) of this province in a very personal way. I think he will find this also in terms of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Elgie).

I happen to know what the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations has gone through in the discharge of his responsibilities. It is fair to be critical of his ministry's function. It is fair to be critical of what the policies may be. But to say that he does not believe him or he does not trust him when he gives his best information to the House is not the way, in my humble opinion, the political process should work.

I do not say for a moment that ministers of the crown are above making mistakes. I cannot think of any, but sure, they make them; I make them. To err is to be human, and we are human on this side of the House. We do not err too often. But I do not think it helps the Liberal Party of Ontario to create the perception of these personal attacks upon individual ministers of the crown. I have tried to stay away from that in terms of my own political experience.

I will give members some factual information. Interjection.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, I was not. I was quoting exactly what the member's leader said. I did not make any comments.

I will give members some factual information. They can be critical of differences of opinion that may exist on this side of the House. He can exaggerate them, I say to the leader-in-waiting, but it is the public perception that counts and he should know that in terms of public perception the Liberal Party of Ontario is at one of its lowest ebbs in recent political history.

Mr. Van Horne: Baloney.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is true.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I want to say, before its members take too much delight, that the New Democratic Party is not much better off. I read what the leader of the New Democratic Party said about my being distracted by the leadership of our federal party. I confess that I was. I took two days—actually it was a day and a half. I gave it my undivided attention.

But I have the whole chronology of what

happened when the member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy) announced his resignation. I know exactly how many weeks it took the present leader of the NDP to decide whether he would move from the major leagues to the minor leagues. I know how long it took him to decide whether he would run for a seat in this House. I know how long he sat up there leading the fortunes of his party, 30 feet away from his responsibilities as a member. He should never speak to me about being distracted, because he did not have the foggiest idea of what he wanted to do then; I am not sure he has the foggiest idea of what he wants to do now.

5:10 p.m.

What intrigues me—I say this to the leader of the New Democrats—is a quote I have got for him.

Mr. Martel: Is this a quote from the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Timbrell)?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, this is a quote from a very prominent member of the New Democratic Party. I will not identify him yet. He was commenting on the results in the 1968 election. Nothing really has changed. I do not believe much changes in history. "The almost unbearable self-righteousness of the NDP was revealed in all of its glory." That was not Stephen Lewis. That was not any other noted journalist. That was the member for York South (Mr. Rae) in the University of Toronto Varsity in 1968, and nothing has changed.

Mr. T. P. Reid: They have got more self-righteous.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Davis: What does the member mean, who was in charge? I was Minister of University Affairs. I identified him then as potentially an intelligent young man who might have the wisdom to become a member of this party, but knowing full well he never would; so I kept track of him. Does he want some more? No, I am taking too much time.

Some hon. members: More.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Can I come for a few moments to—

Mr. Wildman: To the throne speech.

Mr. Breaugh: Don't be distracted.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, I do not want to be distracted. If it were not for the distractions I would not have half as much fun.

Mr. Martel: You have nothing to say.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member for Sudbury East is just about provoking me.

Dealing with some of the objectives in the throne speech, I listened very carefully to the observations about youth unemployment and the activities of the task force. I will make no comment. I think the leader-in-waiting was endeavouring to be constructive. I respect that. I am not sure how helpful the ideas were, but I think the motivation was fine.

I said earlier today that in terms of particulars, it is necessary for the members of this House to wait until the presentation of the Treasurer's budget on Tuesday of the coming week. I think I am fairly objective, and I do not minimize the depth of the economic problems this province and this whole country have faced, but I said a year ago and I believe it to be true that we are emerging from the economic difficulty. We have weathered it better than many other places in terms of the impact.

I heard the member for Renfrew North (Mr. Conway)—and I will not tease him any more about being the leader-in-waiting; we all know it is true, so there is no point stating the obvious any further—and the observations he made about my neighbour the member for Wellington-Dufferin-Peel (Mr. J. M. Johnson), who represents that great riding that takes in Caledon.

I do not think any of us in the past six to eight months has not experienced individual problems presented to us in our constituency offices or here at the House in terms of the impact of the present economic situation upon the lives of individuals. For me, as head of the government, it has been a very difficult period. While we here are, I hope gainfully employed, I think we can have a sensitivity, an understanding and an awareness of what these people are experiencing.

Once again I can fairly state that this government, in terms of what it has attempted to do, has demonstrated a sensitivity. Sure, it can be argued that we could do more, that we should spend more, but at the same time we have a responsibility to retain some measure of balance and some capacity in terms of fiscal management.

I do not minimize the present situation, but at the same time I really have a genuine measure of optimism. I look at the auto sector. While not as deeply involved as the member for Essex North (Mr. Ruston), the member for Essex South (Mr. Mancini), the member for Oakville (Mr. Snow) and the member for Oshawa (Mr. Breauth), we

do have some modest interest in the great riding of Brampton.

Mr. Cooke: Who owns that company?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Listen, I make no apologies. I went to see the Prime Minister of France, and I said to him, "Prime Minister, irrespective of your political philosophies, the more you invest in Brampton, the more I will take." I make no apologies for it. I say to the financial critic for the New Democrats that I have listened to him and I have listened to others who, over the past two years, have said how Windsor is going down the tubes, the auto industry is going down the tubes and we are never going to recover, we are never going to survive.

I ask the member to look at the figures today. I ask if he is prepared to make the same observations today, because the reality is that the auto industry, particularly in Ontario, shows real signs of recovery. In terms of any percentage figures, we have a higher level of employment in the auto sector in this province than does any state of the union. This is true. Partly that is because of good management by government and partly because of product allocation, which turns out to be beneficial. I accept that. However, there was a readiness to write them off a year and a half ago. In fact, it has not happened. When I am speaking about the auto sector—

Mr. Martel: Things are so good in St. Catharines.

Hon. Mr. Davis: There are problems in many places. There are still problems in Sudbury; I accept that.

Mr. Martel: Still? They are monumental.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I accept it. Briefly, because I did not have much time, I read the member's presentation; I read the task force report that he publicized today. I do not know who was smoking what when they drafted it, but ask him please to analyse the mathematics of it. It is great to say, "We are going to spend \$11 million" or whatever it is "over five years." The members are telling the people of Ontario they are going to nationalize just about everything in sight, but they should tell everybody how they are going to afford it.

Mr. Martel: That is Jim Gordon.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The members probably have not even read the document; they probably have not read their own policy paper. Oh, they have not read it. It only came out this morning; they have not had the time.

Dealing with the auto sector—and I am not totally comfortable in these approaches, because they can appear to be contradictory—I have said in many speeches, as have the Treasurer and the Minister of Industry and Trade (Mr. Walker), that it is fundamental that this province export and be competitive. We have to understand that to survive economically we are going to have to deal with our competitors in a constructive, friendly fashion.

While there may appear to some members of the House to be some measure of contradiction when we say in the throne speech that we would support particular measures for the auto sector, I put it very simplistically on this basis: I think we are dealing with a market situation that cannot be described as being totally free in that sense of the word. Ontario does not have the capacity to adjust the value of the Canadian dollar. We are not in a position, as are some nations, to alter our dollar values to make our product more competitive in the marketplace.

The auto sector is so fundamental to the economic wellbeing of Ontario and, through that, of Canada that I am prepared to support certain initiatives that do not protect our auto sector but rather give it a better opportunity to compete, to adjust and to see that it gets a fair share in terms of what is happening in other countries.

I was in western Europe very briefly and talked to some people at the European Economic Community, who are great believers in free trade. I said to them, "How many automobiles do you allow in from the Far East?" The figures are staggering. Some countries allow 2,000 units and some 3,000; one allows 5,000 units. These people believe in free trade, but they have policies that restrict free access.

In Australia, when I was there for business purposes, I found intriguing that in a country that has some feeling about "competitive nature and free trade" there is an 85 per cent Australian content rule so that their auto sector can survive.

Mr. R. F. Johnston: We have been saying that for years.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Some of the positions of the opposition are a shade contradictory; those of the government are always consistent.

While I think it is fundamental for Ontario business and all of us to understand that our ability to compete economically must be geared to an international situation, we cannot fight that. It is fundamental as well that we recognize that this industry is fundamental. While some

opposite might point out a contradiction, and I do not think they will, I hope they understand the rationale behind it.

5:20 p.m.

When I am speaking of this I should point out it is fundamental, as we look down the road not just in the next two months or six months, that as we see signs of economic recovery taking place we have to understand something fundamental. It is not a popular thing to say, but all of us must maintain a real measure of moderation in terms of what we expect to take out of an economic upturn.

The competition out there is, without question, tough. We have to understand what is happening in countries where we compete. We have to look at the experience in the United States. Whether the people over there like it or not, they happen to be our best customers, they also happen to be our strongest competitors. There must be a degree of moderation. We must understand that when the economy picks up, and when profits begin to improve, if they are not reinvested the recovery will not be sustained.

My late mother always said "moderation in all things." She was referring to another matter, but I think it applies. It is essential for Ontarians and Canadians to exercise a degree of moderation. This has to be understood by the public sector, by the private sector and by government.

I listened to some of the observations of the member for Renfrew North in terms of financial management. The Treasurer will deal with this on Tuesday, but I may not get the opportunity because I will not be speaking immediately after Tuesday.

I have to say that on any objective assessment, one reason this province has been able to give some encouragement to a recovery, one reason we have been able to maintain a degree of stability through these difficult months, is because this province happens to have the best-managed government of any government in Canada. I say that without fear of contradiction. It is not an easy responsibility.

Mr. Nixon: You believe in moderation but not in humility.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would say to the member that if I have one attribute it has always been humility. He may not agree with that.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Davis: There are some days. I know exactly the quote the member is prepared to use

but it is very old. I have a better one for him but I will not tell him today.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I tell the member for Kitchen (Mr. Breithaupt) that he worries about the age of this government. I wish, and I know he wishes, that he was as vital, as enthusiastic, as energetic, as confident and as capable as the members on this side of the House because if he felt that way he might be over here instead of over there. Look at this group of people. They are energetic, enthusiastic, confident and capable.

[Applause]

Hon. Mr. Davis: To retain the members' modesty, they are not to applaud themselves. They can applaud me but not themselves.

When I say this about the need to understand the financial management, the Treasurer is pressed and every minister of the crown is pressed, as the members opposite are, by individuals, groups or organizations seeking more by way either of assistance or encouragement from government.

Part of our responsibility, unfortunately, is to say "no" on occasion. Part of our responsibility is to say to people for whom we have great sympathy, "We cannot afford it." That has been a policy of this government and one reason we have been able to manage the affairs of this province effectively in a financial sense. I want to give the Treasurer full credit because I do not sense the members of the opposition will do so on Tuesday even if, in their heart of hearts, they would like to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot keep track of the clock. How much longer have I got?

Mr. Speaker: The Premier has 21 minutes and 40 seconds.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I will not take 21 minutes. Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I expect to see ads go across there any time.

Mr. Rae: It won't be long. We will be paying for them.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The Minister of Tourism and Recreation (Mr. Baetz) will have "Yours to Discover." The members opposite should have that on their side right now, "Yours to Discover," or "Preserve It, Conserve It."

I want to deal with one other part of the throne speech that—

Mr. Martel: You have not dealt with any yet.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I have. I have dealt with the auto sector, the economy and youth employment. I do have some words of advice for the member for Renfrew North. Before he comments on what this government is doing with respect to women, on the policies that will be emerging, and on the fact we will have some definitive proposals for the public of this province, before he sets himself up as an expert knowing anything about it, he ought to change his marital status so he can speak with some modest degree of knowledge.

I have said this to Ronald too. That was friendly advice.

Mr. Wildman: Are you serious? Susan Fish, do you agree with that?

Hon. Mr. Davis: What do you mean? Susan, stay away from him.

I want to deal with the reference in the throne speech to certain initiatives the government will be proposing with respect to altering the legislation in the area of French education. I want to deal with it simply and in a very constructive fashion. Some have suggested there is a modest degree of contradiction in the proposal the government will be bringing forward during the course of this Legislature and positions the government had taken in previous constitutional discussions.

I would like to remind all members of the House that the determination and initiative taken by this province to include in the Canadian Constitution the education of young people in either of the two official languages of Canada where numbers warrant was done to encourage some of our sister provinces to participate. It has been the law of this province for some years that where sufficient numbers or heads of families are together, the school boards will provide an educational experience. We have done it in a way I think has been acceptable, in a way that has been understood and in a way that has been sensitive.

It has been the view of the government, and I say this as a personal view as well, that we have reached a point in this province where, in the field of special education for instance, if a youngster was in Orangeville and the Dufferin board was not able to offer a course in special education of some kind, he was able to purchase that service from the Peel board or vice versa.

It is not a new principle. It is not unique. What we are doing in this proposal is extending as a matter of principle to the francophone youngsters and the anglophone youngsters, in those areas where they constitute the minority, the

opportunity for an education in either of the two official languages of Canada as a matter of legislated right here in the province.

Mr. Bradley: I did not hear about that in the Carleton by-election.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member for St. Catharines (Mr. Bradley) misunderstood. Some day I will try to explain it to him and to the member for Renfrew North. I hope to be able to do that on a personal basis because, with great respect, the member's former leader—I will not get into that since he is not here. The member does not understand it.

Mr. Bradley: I understand very well. I saw—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Come on. The member does not understand it because he is disappointed he lost.

Hon. Mr. Pope: Did you hear what Stuart Smith said in Timmins?

Hon. Mr. Davis: That is right, and what your friend said up in Mattawa.

I am trying to deal with this without being controversial. I can remember what some of his members said in Essex if he wants. I will not, but do not raise that with me.

Mr. Bradley: Don't set yourself up as a man of virtue on that issue. I saw those—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Come on. I would never be as presumptuous as the member is to set myself up as a person of virtue on any issue. I do it out of conscience and out of sensitivity. The member should not let his ego get in the way of his own good judgement. I mean it.

Mr. R. F. Johnston: Take some time to talk about the unemployed for a moment.

Hon. Mr. Davis: If the member opposite does not think this is a serious issue, I regret that. I want the record to state that the member for Scarborough West (Mr. R. F. Johnston) does not believe the education of francophone youngsters is a serious issue. Is that what the member is saying?

Mr. R. F. Johnston: Don't give me that garbage. I am talking about the unemployed.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I will come to the unemployed, but can I not deal with this issue? Is this not an issue important to the member's party? Then do not interrupt.

Mr. R. F. Johnston: Certainly it is. We know where you have stood on it for the last 20 years, so don't start that on us. We know where you have stood on this for a long time.

Mr. Rae: Don't get on that stuff.

5:30 p.m.

Hon. Mr. Davis: He started it. Tell the member for Scarborough West just to relax, sit back, and let me finish.

Mr. R. F. Johnston: Don't get into name calling. Deal with some substance.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No one is name calling. The member is the only one who has that tendency.

I recognize sensitivity, but this is a matter that is important not just in terms of the educational rights of these young people, but in terms of a principle and a policy for the Legislature of this province.

I will not deal with the other aspects which will be more complicated in terms of what is going to be presented, in terms of school board structure and the responsibilities of the minister. To me, the significant aspect of what was contained in the throne speech under that section was a simple, basic right, and that is the right of a francophone or anglophone youngster to have an educational program in his or her own language. That is something we will see carried out.

[Applause]

Mr. McClellan: On the applause meter, I would say that is a minus three.

Hon. Mr. Pope: I didn't hear you applaud.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I did not see him applaud at all. I thought the member for Cornwall (Mr. Samis) would show some measure of enthusiasm. I certainly know the member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick), if he were still on the front bench, would have applauded.

I will not deal at length with further economic discussions because we will have ample opportunity on Tuesday.

I would like to finalize my observations by going back to the member for Renfrew North when he was observing about what he felt were certain contradictions emanating from ministers of the crown. I have been Premier for 12 years and I was a minister for nine years. I have heard this sort of tactic used before.

The member from Sudbury used to do it with eloquence. He used to do it with a certain flair. He had a style. I sat there and listened. He reorganized the total front bench and then sat down knowing in his own heart of hearts that he or his party would never be in a position to assume the responsibility for the actual judgements that are made on this side of the House.

Things have not changed. I have listened. I have tried to encourage their co-operation. I am earnestly seeking their support for this enlightened throne speech and what it means for the

future of this province. I know in advance I have failed because nothing has changed. The New Democrats are captives of their own theology. They have that tunnel vision which has no real future in terms of the people of this province.

I look at the Liberal Party or community party of Ontario. I see contradictions, I see lack of leadership, I see no cohesion in caucus and I see them being there five years hence. The faces may change but the policies will not alter and this government will be here for some years hence.

Mr. Speaker: On Tuesday, April 19, Mr. Brandt moved, seconded by Mr. Eves, that an humble address be presented to the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor as follows:

To the Honourable John Black Aird, an officer of the Order of Canada, one of Her Majesty's counsel learned in the law, bachelor of arts, doctor of laws, Lieutenant Governor of Ontario:

We, Her Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Legislative Assembly of the province of Ontario, now assembled, beg leave to thank Your Honour for the gracious speech Your Honour has addressed to us.

On Thursday, April 21, Ms. Copps moved, seconded by Mr. Nixon, that the motion be amended by adding the following thereto:

"This House, however, regrets that the speech from the throne fails to address the most serious problems facing Ontario today, reflecting a total lack of government initiative, leadership and policy necessary to resolve these concerns, namely, the continuing unemployment crisis, particularly among this province's youth; the pressing need for a definitive industrial strategy, particularly the need for massive training and retraining programs; the urgent need for affordable housing in this province; the preservation of Ontario's health, social and educational sectors, and particularly support for hospitals, day care, services for the elderly and post-secondary institutions; the continuing problems facing farmers during these recessionary times. Therefore, this House declares its lack of confidence in the government."

Today Mr. Foulds moved, seconded by Mr. Rae, that the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor be amended by adding after the word "time," and before the words, "Therefore, this House declares its lack of confidence in the government," the following:

"And further, this House regrets that the provincial government has utterly failed to

respond to the bankruptcy of Liberal government policies and has instead simply produced a vague and aimless speech worthy of liberalism itself rather than acting decisively to provide jobs, health and housing for Ontario's people."

The first question to be decided is the amendment to the amendment to the motion.

5:47 p.m.

The House divided on the amendment to the amendment by Mr. Foulds, which was negatived on the following vote:

Ayes

Allen, Breaugh, Bryden, Cassidy, Charlton, Cooke, Di Santo, Foulds, Grande, Johnston, R. F., Laughren, Lupusella, Mackenzie, Martel, McClellan, Philip, Rae, Renwick, Samis, Stokes, Swart, Wildman.

Nays

Andrewes, Ashe, Baetz, Barlow, Bennett, Bernier, Birch, Boudria, Bradley, Brandt, Breithaupt, Conway, Copps, Cousens, Cunningham, Davis, Dean, Drea, Eakins, Eaton, Edighoffer, Elgie, Elston, Epp, Fish, Gillies, Gordon, Gregory, Haggerty, Harris, Havrot, Henderson, Hennessy, Hodgson;

Johnson, J. M., Jones, Kennedy, Kerr, Kerrio, Kolyan, Lane, Leluk, MacQuarrie, Mancini, McCaffrey, McCague, McEwen, McGuigan, McKessock, McLean, McNeil, Miller, F. S., Miller, G. I., Mitchell, Newman, Nixon, Norton, O'Neil, Peterson, Piché, Pollock, Pope, Ramsay, Reed, J. A., Reid, T. P., Riddell, Robinson, Rotenberg, Runciman, Ruprecht, Ruston;

Sargent, Scrivener, Sheppard, Shymko, Spensieri, Sterling, Stevenson, K. R., Sweeney, Taylor, G. W., Taylor, J. A., Timbrell, Treleven, Van Horne, Villeneuve, Walker, Watson, Welch, Wells, Williams, Wiseman, Worton, Wrye, Yakabuski.

Ayes 22; nays 94.

5:52 p.m.

The House divided on Ms. Copps's amendment, which was negatived on the following vote:

Ayes

Allen, Boudria, Bradley, Breaugh, Breithaupt, Bryden, Cassidy, Charlton, Conway, Cooke, Copps, Cunningham, Di Santo, Eakins, Edighoffer, Elston, Epp, Foulds, Grande, Haggerty, Johnston, R. F., Kerrio, Laughren, Lupusella;

Mackenzie, Mancini, Martel, McClellan, McEwen, McGuigan, McKessock, Miller, G. I., Newman, Nixon, O'Neil, Peterson, Philip, Rae, Reed, J. A., Reid, T. P., Renwick, Riddell,

Ruprecht, Ruston, Samis, Sargent, Spensieri, Stokes, Swart, Sweeney, Van Horne, Wildman, Worton, Wrye.

Nays

Andrewes, Ashe, Baetz, Barlow, Bennett, Bernier, Birch, Brandt, Cousens, Davis, Dean, Drea, Eaton, Elgie, Fish, Gillies, Gordon, Gregory, Harris, Havrot, Henderson, Hennessy, Hodgson, Johnson, J. M., Jones, Kennedy, Kerr, Kolyn, Lane, Leluk, MacQuarrie, McCaffrey, McCague, McLean, McNeil, Miller, F. S., Mitchell;

Norton, Piché, Pollock, Pope, Ramsay, Robinson, Rotenberg, Runciman, Scrivener, Sheppard, Shymko, Sterling, Stevenson, K. R., Taylor, G. W., Taylor, J. A., Timbrell, Treleaven, Villeneuve, Walker, Watson, Welch, Wells, Williams, Wiseman, Yakabuski.

Ayes 54; nays 62.

The House divided on Mr. Brandt's main motion, which was agreed to on the same vote reversed.

Resolved: That an humble address be presented to the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor as follows:

To the Honourable John Black Aird, an officer of the Order of Canada, one of Her Majesty's counsel learned in the law, bachelor of arts, doctor of laws, Lieutenant Governor of Ontario:

We, Her Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Legislative Assembly of the province of Ontario, now assembled, beg leave to thank Your Honour for the gracious speech Your Honour has addressed to us.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I would like to indicate the business for the remainder of this week and for next week.

Tonight we will deal with legislation; first, committee of the whole on Bill 7, followed by second reading and committee of the whole, if necessary, on Bills 3, 4, 5 and 13. If there is time, we will have second reading of Bill 2 and committee of the whole, if necessary.

Mr. Conway: The waste bill?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Not tonight.

Tomorrow, Friday, May 6, we will continue any legislation that is not completed this evening.

On Monday, May 9, we will also continue with any legislation that has not been completed, and then as time permits we will debate government notice of motion 6 standing on the order paper respecting concurrence in the appointment of the chairman of the Commission on Election Contributions and Expenses.

On Tuesday, May 10, routine proceedings will begin as usual at 2 p.m. When they are completed, there will be a short recess until precisely 4 p.m., when the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) will make his budget address. As indicated before, the House will not sit next Tuesday evening.

On Wednesday, May 11, any of the usual committees may sit.

On Thursday, May 12, budget replies by both opposition Treasury critics will be in the afternoon, and in the evening we will begin the budget debate, which will also continue on Friday.

The House recessed at 6 p.m.

CONTENTS

Thursday, May 5, 1983

Oral questions

Bennett, Hon. C. F., Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing:	
Hospital beds , Mr. Roy, Mr. Cassidy.	479
Birch, Hon. M., Provincial Secretary for Social Development:	
Extra billing , Mr. McClellan, Ms. Copps.	477
Davis, Hon. W. G., Premier:	
Youth unemployment , Mr. Peterson, Mr. T. P. Reid, Mr. Cooke, Mr. Mancini.	471
Funding for education , Mr. Peterson, Mr. Allen, Mr. Bradley.	472
Extendicare Ltd. , Mr. Rae, Ms. Copps.	474
Miller, Hon. F. S., Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics:	
Welfare payments , Mr. R. F. Johnston, Mr. Wildman, Mr. T. P. Reid.	478
Norton, Hon. K. C., Minister of the Environment:	
Salford landfill site , Mr. Elston.	478
Ramsay, Hon. R. H., Minister of Labour:	
Death of Gary Guilbeault , Mr. Rae, Mr. Wildman.	476
Equal opportunities for women , Ms. Bryden, Mr. Wrye.	480
Walker, Hon. G. W., Minister of Industry and Trade:	
Employees' purchase of plant , Mr. Van Horne.	481

Petitions

START Centre , Mr. McNeil, tabled.	482
McCarthy's Sandblasting , Ms. Copps, tabled.	482

Report

Standing committee on regulations and other statutory instruments , Mr. Kerr, tabled. . . .	482
--	-----

Motion

Private members' public business , Mr. Wells, agreed to.	482
---	-----

First reading

Workers' Compensation Amendment Act , Bill 30, Mr. Haggerty, agreed to.	482
--	-----

Throne speech debate

Mr. Foulds.	483
Mr. Conway.	490
Mr. Davis.	499

Other business

Business of the House , Mr. Wells.	508
Recess	508

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Allen, R. (Hamilton West NDP)
Ashe, Hon. G. L., Minister of Revenue (Durham West PC)
Bennett, Hon. C. F., Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Ottawa South PC)
Birch, Hon. M., Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Scarborough East PC)
Bradley, J. J. (St. Catharines L)
Brandt, A. S. (Sarnia PC)
Breaugh, M. J. (Oshawa NDP)
Bryden, M. H. (Beaches-Woodbine NDP)
Cassidy, M. (Ottawa Centre NDP)
Conway, S. G. (Renfrew North L)
Cooke, D. S. (Windsor-Riverside NDP)
Copp, S. M. (Hamilton Centre L)
Cureatz, S. L., Deputy Speaker and Chairman (Durham East PC)
Davis, Hon. W. G., Premier (Brampton PC)
Elston, M. J. (Huron-Bruce L)
Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP)
Haggerty, R. (Erie L)
Hennessy, M. (Fort William PC)
Johnston, R. F. (Scarborough West NDP)
Kerrio, V. G. (Niagara Falls L)
Mancini, R. (Essex South L)
Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
McClellan, R. A. (Bellwoods NDP)
McNeil, R. K. (Elgin PC)
Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
Norton, Hon. K. C., Minister of the Environment (Kingston and the Islands PC)
O'Neil, H. P. (Quinte L)
Peterson, D. R. (London Centre L)
Pope, Hon. A. W., Minister of Natural Resources (Cochrane South PC)
Rae, R. K. (York South NDP)
Ramsay, Hon. R. H., Minister of Labour (Sault Ste. Marie PC)
Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L-Lab.)
Robinson, A. M., Acting Speaker (Scarborough-Ellesmere PC)
Rotenberg, D. (Wilson Heights PC)
Roy, A. J. (Ottawa East L)
Sheppard, H. N. (Northumberland PC)
Stokes, J. E. (Lake Nipigon NDP)
Swart, M. L. (Welland-Thorold NDP)
Sweeney, J. (Kitchener-Wilmot L)
Turner, Hon. J. M., Speaker (Peterborough PC)
Van Horne, R. G. (London North L)
Walker, Hon. G. W., Minister of Industry and Trade (London South PC)
Wells, Hon. T. L., Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Scarborough North PC)
Wildman, B. (Algoma NDP)
Wrye, W. M. (Windsor-Sandwich L)



Hansard

Official Report of Debates

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Third Session, 32nd Parliament

Thursday, May 5, 1983

Evening Sitting

Speaker: Honourable John M. Turner

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

Contents of the proceedings reported in this issue of Hansard appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of the speakers taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is \$15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, Information Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 965-2238.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Thursday, May 5, 1983

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

House in committee of the whole.

TORONTO FUTURES EXCHANGE ACT

Consideration of Bill 7, An Act to incorporate the Toronto Futures Exchange.

On section 1:

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Mitchell moves that clause 1(c) of the bill be amended by adding at the commencement thereof, "commodity."

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Chairman, it may be that in this some explanation would be needed, because the term "commodity futures contract" and the term "commodity futures option" are apparently to have similar meaning. Are we now adding a third item so that we are reading "commodity," "commodity futures contract" and "commodity futures option" to have the same meaning? Is that the intention?

Mr. Mitchell: Mr. Chairman, was a further amendment, an eighth amendment numbered 1(f), circulated to the honourable member, perhaps late yesterday?

Mr. Breithaupt: I received a series of amendments that came to the office yesterday.

Mr. Mitchell: There was an amendment 1(f), which is an addition. The member will find that amendment 1(f) brings the whole thing in line following his question.

This is a housekeeping amendment to coincide with the introduction of the term "commodity" in subsection 4(1) of the bill.

Mr. Breithaupt: So this in effect makes three component parts in clause 1(c) with respect to the amendment?

Mr. Mitchell: That it does.

Mr. Chairman: Will somebody read it the way it should be read now?

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Chairman, it would appear that clause 1(c) would read as follows: "'commodity,' 'commodity futures contract' and 'commodity futures option' have the same meaning as in the Commodity Futures Act."

Mr. Mitchell: That is correct.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you.

Mr. Swart: Mr. Chairman, the honourable

member who just spoke is correct. I am sure he understands that there is a definition of commodities, commodity futures contract and commodity futures option in the Commodity Futures Act. This puts the definition, therefore, exactly in line with that act.

This act would be incomplete if we did not give a definition for "commodities." Nobody would know what one was talking about if one were talking about commodities. So it is very important that we have the definition in there if this futures exchange is going to work.

It is precisely for that reason that we will vote against the insertion of the word "commodity." We oppose this bill in principle and, therefore, we do not particularly want to see it working well. But if the bill is going to work it is necessary to have the definition of "commodity" in the Commodity Futures Act.

The definition is: "Commodity means, whether in the original or a processed state, any agricultural product, forest product, product of the sea, mineral, metal, hydrocarbon fuel, currency or precious stone or other gem, and any goods, article, service, right or interest, or class thereof, designated as a commodity under the regulation."

We find that makes a very broad definition and the Commodities Futures Exchange will be able to deal in all those items, plus anything the minister may want to add in the regulations.

Precisely because there are futures exchanges around the world, if there is no futures exchange here, there is still going to be the trading necessary under the present system.

We should be moving away from the principles of manipulators in the market and towards international futures agreements that put stability into prices. Therefore, we have voted against the bill and will be voting against this amendment as well, because it makes the bill more functional and it is the function we are not in agreement with.

8:10 p.m.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Chairman, we will support the bill. We recognize the necessity and the requirements for a commodities futures exchange. The member for Welland-Thorold (Mr. Swart),

in his lonely approach to speaking on this bill, has missed the requirement to have this kind of framework in place to deal properly and appropriately with these circumstances in which the agricultural and other operations of the world exist. We will be supporting this amendment.

Mr. Chairman: All those in favour of Mr. Mitchell's amendment will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion the ayes have it.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Mitchell moves that clause 1(f) of the bill be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

"'Futures member' means a member of the corporation who conducts the business of trading commodities, options on commodities, commodity futures contracts and commodity futures options and who is admitted to membership in accordance with the bylaws."

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to accept the amendment.

Mr. Swart: Mr. Chairman, we also will accept this amendment. It is a definition that does not fundamentally affect the bill. It is a necessary definition.

Motion agreed to.

Section 1, as amended, agreed to.

Sections 2 and 3 agreed to.

On section 4:

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Mitchell moves that subsection 4(1) of the bill be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

"The object of the corporation is to operate an exchange in Ontario for trading in commodities, options on commodities, commodity futures contracts and commodity futures options by the members of the corporation and other persons authorized under subsection (2)."

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Chairman, in this circumstance, the changes with respect to the option of the corporation seem to be appropriate as they now include the three portions of the terms that were referred to in the original definition section. I am quite prepared to accept the amendment.

Mr. Swart: Mr. Chairman, I realize this change is made to incorporate into this subsection the word "commodities" as well as "commodity futures contracts" etc., and once again it is necessary. However, the principle is outlined thoroughly in this one section that tells what the commodity futures is all about, and because of

that we will vote against this section.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Chairman, there has been some discussion about this before. Our party expressed concern about the nature of the bill at the time it came up some time ago for second reading. I want to say a few words about what is really happening here.

The government has moved once again and has decided to accept the representations made from Bay Street with respect to the creation of this commodity futures market, the Toronto Futures Exchange, which will be linked to the Toronto Stock Exchange but which will be to some extent independent of it.

In the course of this, not only will there be trading in commodities and in commodity futures but also, and I believe this is new for Ontario, in options on commodity futures which, as the parliamentary assistant to the minister knows, are a means of gambling with almost no money down at all. When you buy an option, you pay a very low price. If it goes up, you make a lot and if it goes down, you lose virtually everything put in.

What the government has done is to add another financial or gambling instrument into the structure of Toronto's financial network. It seems to me an argument could be made that perhaps this is a sensible thing. That might be so if this had been a government which over the course of 10 years, or the time prior to the creation of the futures exchange, had been actively at work to make sure there was a future for commodities in Ontario.

Instead, what we have is a government that is prepared to create a commodity futures market so people who live in North York or Forest Hill, people who want to gamble or, as some would argue, perform a function in the market, although I am not sure what it is, people who want to play with money around real commodities are facilitated, while people who simply want to produce commodities in Ontario and make a decent living from that find themselves unable to sell their commodities. They find the commodities they sell are not price-supported; therefore, they do not have assurance against the kind of vicissitudes of the market which have existed for so long. They find this is a government that is not prepared to back them up.

A few days ago I spent a bit of time in England visiting my wife's relatives. When I was there, it seemed to me that under Margaret Thatcher one could see very much the same kind of thing we can see here in Ontario under the Progress-

sive Conservative government. Mrs. Thatcher and her government are very much prisoners of the City of London. They are very concerned about the status of sterling, the status of the Bank of England and the status of the financial and commodity markets in the City of London. They are so transfixed about what happens in London and in the financial industry in that country that they have completely forgotten about the need to ensure there is a future for commodities and manufactured products and the people who make them in Britain. That is a situation that is happening here as well.

If there were to be a balanced policy, then the government would say: "We have an intention of creating a market for commodity futures, but first we are going to make sure the men and women, the families and the communities who depend on those commodities are going to have a decent, assured future and that will be our priority. We are going to take action with respect to all those miners who have been more than half a year without work in Sudbury to ensure they can have a decent future for themselves, their children and their families. We are going to take action for those farmers who were so hard hit by the increase in"—

Mr. Chairman: I have allowed the honourable member to continue on at great length. I think it is time I got him back to the subsection.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Chairman, this is very much on the subsection. It says, "The object of the corporation is to operate an exchange in Ontario for trading in commodities, options on commodities, commodity futures contracts and commodity futures options by the members of the corporation and other persons authorized under subsection (2)."

Not only is this a broad definition, but also it is this kind of commodities trading which in the past has been used to bankrupt decent, ordinary people who are producers of corn, oats, barley and other commodities. All commodities are provided for in this legislation.

You may find it uncomfortable, Mr. Chairman, but perhaps occasionally in this House we should pause, step back and look at what can only be described as mistakes that have been made in the past in terms of the victimization of ordinary people by the powers of finance capital. I am sorry to use those words, but that is what is facilitated by the creation of this futures market.

The minister's parliamentary assistant can say, "There are some economies in the world

that are inflexible, that have no give and take at all and that do not work particularly well because they do not have some mechanisms such as the mechanisms that are proposed in the futures exchange." That may be, but that is not the situation here. In this province, are we to give priority to the needs of people or to the needs of finance?

What this amendment does—and I hope the parliamentary assistant responds to this—is simply to underline the intention of this government to make sure the people who deal in pieces of paper and make fortunes therefrom will have priority over the needs of people who deal in real things and are finding their existence very tough.

8:20 p.m.

I found the whole procedure, the whole series of events that surrounded the exemption from action against Conrad Black not curious at all when it comes to the priorities of this government, when it comes to somebody whose only useful purpose in society has been to dicker around with trading in shares and trading in commodities. People like that could come in, they could talk to the minister, they could get exemption. They could do all kinds of things that would be quite unconscionable. On the other hand, when it is somebody such as one of those poor farmers who in the end had to resort to direct action because nothing else was around—

Mr. Ruston: There are a lot of farmers in Ottawa.

Mr. Cassidy: I have the richest farm land in the province in my riding of Ottawa Centre. I hope the honourable member will recognize that. When it comes to the needs of those farmers, people who have been driven to the wall by high interest rates, by high costs of inputs and by inadequate returns for their products, can they walk in to see the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry)? Can they even dream of having an interview with the minister of whatever it is and with one or two of his assistants to bring their plight before him? No, they cannot.

It seems to me that is the kind of priority we are getting from the Conservative government. We have seen today or yesterday how the actions and the attitudes of this government, and in particular of its leader, eventually catch up with them. It is poetic justice to me that it was the inaction of the Premier (Mr. Davis) with respect to the rights of Franco-Ontarians and

the way the Premier treated the legitimate concerns of western Canada that finally came up to haunt him and to drop him from becoming leader of the Progressive Conservative Party and possibly Prime Minister of Canada.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Ottawa Centre is going a little far afield.

Mr. Cassidy: I am just about through, Mr. Chairman. I only want to suggest that the priority this government gives to the needs of financiers over the needs of ordinary people is going to catch up with it one of these days.

Mr. Mitchell: Mr. Chairman, I feel I have to respond to the member for Ottawa Centre in that there is a farmer in this Legislature who spoke on second reading. I refer to the member for Kent-Elgin (Mr. McGuigan). I think he defended this for the benefit of the farmers out there. I stand to be corrected, but I seem to recall him speaking very emphatically in support of this bill. The bill is a form of protection to make sure that what is being carried on at present becomes regulated.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Chairman, it was interesting to note that the interjection by the member for Ottawa Centre comes from what I believe is the exact same seat where Dr. Shulman, the former member for High Park as it then was, sat during his years in this Legislature. During those years I recall he was quite a champion of a variety of economic opportunities from which we read that he did rather well.

Certainly one is told that in this life the best way to make a million dollars is to write a book about making a million dollars, or by starting one's own new religion. Those two things aside, the mechanics of operation that clearly exist in the marketplace to balance and deal with the expectation of commodity futures are the realities of the world in which we live. To ignore that is something we would do at our peril.

As I recall, the parliamentary assistant quite clearly reminded this House of the learned and particularly professional contribution my colleague the member for Kent-Elgin brought to the second reading debate on this subject.

You may recall, Mr. Chairman, that after my introductory remarks and those of the member for Welland-Thorold it was indeed a delight to hear someone who knew something about the bill speak. Accordingly we welcomed not only some additional and intelligent comments but also the necessity to deal with these problems of agricultural development in a balanced and reasonable way.

Certainly the whole object of this bill, which is in subsection 4(1), is something with which we on this side of the House can agree, because we know the necessity of planning and dealing with commodities in Ontario.

In spite of the *cri du coeur* from the member for Ottawa Centre, we will be supporting this amended section.

Mr. Chairman: I am going to ask the member for Kent-Elgin (Mr. McGuigan) to—

Mr. Nixon: Repeat his speech?

Mr. Chairman:—to have a little kick at the can here.

Mr. Swart: Mr. Chairman, is there rotation here?

Mr. Chairman: I did not see anybody stand up over there.

Mr. McGuigan: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I hesitate to enter this debate because I felt that—

Mr. Swart: When will you recognize me, Mr. Chairman? I will make it easy for you.

Mr. McGuigan: Mr. Chairman, I really do not want to repeat that speech and I hesitate to enter the fray at all because I thought it was evident to anyone who calls himself a financial expert that the honourable member has been spouting a great deal of nonsense as to breaking and enslaving the farmers of Ontario.

I would certainly concur with him that I would not want to be part of any bill that was going to do that, but what we are talking about here is simply a system that is a part of doing business.

Today, a farmer planting beans or corn or a number of these main crops in Ontario could contract that crop on the futures market at a pretty reasonable price. He could calculate his costs, because he knows what his fertilizer, gasoline and all those things are going to cost him right now. He could work out his expected yield and he could determine by selling it on the futures market today at a certain price that he would come up with a profit.

Of course, if he wanted to gamble, he would not go into the futures market. He would accept whatever price was available in the fall, be it high or be it low.

When one is talking about gambling—and I think in the last debate our friend referred to farming as something akin to prostitution, although I do not know that prostitution and gambling have any connection—the greatest gambler in the world is the farmer.

He plants his crop and gambles that in the fall there is going to be a certain price on the world market available to him. He can decide then whether he wants to sell it in the cash market, or he can gamble further and store it on his own farm or in a hired elevator, hoping that a few months down the road the price will be higher. But he is dealing in a gambling operation; one takes the gambling out by referring to the futures commodities market.

Just to give a hypothetical example: suppose someone came up with a new recipe for breakfast food that had been test marketed and tried by the nutrition people and the health people and they decided there was a good market for it.

Then he would go for financing and he would tell his bankers: "Well, it is going to cost so many thousands or millions of dollars to put in this processing line. It will cost certain amounts for advertising. There should be, according to our figures, a profit when this is brought to the market some two or three years down the road from now."

Of course, the banker would say: "That is fine based on the prices you have shown us for the basic raw material, but how do you know that two years down the road you can buy that basic raw material at the prices you are currently quoted?"

Of course, the person could answer: "Well, I can lock myself into a contract right now that will tell me two years from now I can buy that commodity at that price and, therefore, I have taken the gambling out of it. I am going to make my profit simply on the narrow margin between the cost of operation and the selling price." One takes the gambling out of it.

8:30 p.m.

Someone else, of course, assumes that gamble. They are the people I think our friends are disparaging, those people who have money and are willing to take some chances. They provide the liquidity for the whole market system because, when I deliver my corn in the fall of the year, I do not phone the elevator and say, "Are you accepting corn today? "Are you paying for corn today?" I do not bother with that. I know they are accepting corn today and I know they are paying for corn today. I go in and I can sell my grain on that cash market for the cash price of that day.

Certainly, that money does not come out of the huge endless pool of money that operator has because they simply do not have that kind of money. We are talking about millions and billions of dollars. That liquidity comes from the

people who are willing to take a chance and they serve a very useful purpose.

I have some hesitation myself about the matter of options because, if there is anything evil in that system, it has to be in the matter of options. That is a highly levered situation. Anybody who goes into an option contract and does not know what he is doing is laying himself open to committing financial suicide or laying himself open to making millions of dollars. As long as it is done for a useful purpose, it does serve a purpose.

If I could go back to the case I mentioned, the fellow with the breakfast food. The banker might say to him: "You've only got so much money to invest in that two-year contract. What are you going to do beyond that?" He could say, "I have taken out options to go beyond that because, for a small amount of money, I can buy a lot of options." Of course, it is dangerous, as I explained. Nevertheless, there are commercial applications for it. I certainly assume that under this act and the other act there are guards and systems in there to prevent abuse of the system.

Remember a few years ago when the Hunt brothers decided to corner the silver market? They got silver up to about \$50 an ounce. I am not aware of the exact price today, but it is something in the \$5 or \$6 range. They decided to corner the total silver supply in the United States and they came awfully close to it. In fact, they had billions of dollars invested in it. The only thing is there was still silver on the market when they ran out of dollars and they could not get that last ounce of silver. That last ounce of silver killed them. It collapsed the whole market and they had to divest themselves of vast quantities of holdings and stocks amounting to hundreds of millions of dollars.

They had violated the Securities Act in that an individual person or corporation or even a family—it was a family that was involved in the Hunt group; I am not sure now whether charges were laid against them or whatever happened to them, but they had violated a rule that said a group could only acquire a certain percentage of the total supply. If we have those rules in this instance and they are looked after and enforced, those terrible things should not happen.

I want to close by saying that what we are talking about is, in general, giving the opportunity to those people who want to take the gambling out of their operations. They can lock themselves into certain prices on either buying or selling and they know what they are doing. This provides the liquidity that is required to

carry those stocks that provide the food, clothing, shoes and all the various minerals and lumber that we all use in our daily lives.

If one wants to talk about international commodity agreements, the most recent one that has been violated—there was a piece in the paper today; I think is Iran which has agreed to a \$2 discount in the price of its oil. What it really comes down to is that international agreements, though written in blood, are not worth a nickel. They are just not worth anything because how do we enforce an international agreement if one of the participants says, "I am opting out of it." Do we send in the marines? Who do we send in to enforce that agreement?

Mr. Breithaupt: Verbal agreements aren't worth the paper they're written on.

Mr. McGuigan: I will not try to upstage that one.

International wheat agreements collapsed in the early 1970s. There was simply more wheat available than there were markets. It is a natural thing that, if one has a supply of a commodity, one is hungry for money and is trying to sell it. If one can sell it for two cents under the market and move a volume of that commodity, that is going to happen. That does happen in international commodity agreements, whether they are signed by socialist countries or by capitalist countries. Whoever signs them, they are not worth a nickel.

Mr. Swart: Mr. Chairman, I am kind of pleased the member for Kent-Elgin spoke first, because I think he did put this whole thing into some kind of perspective, although I may not agree with all the comments he made.

When he speaks about the future purchasing of commodities, having a contract between the producer and the purchaser down the road certainly is not evil, it has some real benefits. But that is not what this futures exchange would provide. It provides for the manipulation of the sale and resale of those contracts.

Mr. McGuigan: It provides the liquidity.

Mr. Swart: Yes. They can be sold over and over again, and they can be traded. As the honourable member has so ably pointed out, not only is this really a sort of sale of these in the exchange, but there can also be manipulation; and there is manipulation of the price. Somebody can corner the market.

He used the illustration of silver. Even in the companies that produced the silver, which were the beneficiaries of that tremendously high price, it was not the workers in those silver

industries, regardless of where it was in the world, who perpetrated the ripoff of the public—and that is what it was; it was the speculators, the people who tried to corner the market. This has been shown to be the case over and over again when one gets into these futures exchanges and people have looked for alternatives to them.

Nothing is perfect in our society. I am the first one to agree with that. International agreements are broken. But by and large those international agreements on commodity prices have brought stability for a period of time to those commodities.

I do not think there is anyone who can deny that the efforts by the producing countries, and the purchasing countries too, to set commodity prices for both coffee and sugar have had some beneficial effect by taking them out of that commodities exchange, where it was left solely to private sector investors who would corner the market to determine what the price was going to be at any given time. I think those are the kinds of goals we have to work towards.

I am old enough to remember, and I am not sure whether the member for Kent-Elgin is, the controversy when we set up the wheat board. An awful lot of farmers opposed it and they gave some of the arguments the member gave here today. But a majority of those farmers determined they could no longer leave it to the futures exchange and the exchange market, so they tried to get greater stability.

It is not directly related, but it has a real bearing on what we are talking about today. They had control over that price. If we could do that further through the international market, we would have greater stability and there would be more for the producers than some manipulation by the financiers by getting prices way up to some fictitious level so they benefit themselves and not the producer.

8:40 p.m.

We in this party think those are the kinds of directions in which we should go. To further facilitate this trading in contracts, particularly now in the options of contracts, without any efforts being made for the stability of commodity prices through international agreement or whatever means can be used, just seems to us to be going in the wrong direction. That is why we oppose this bill and why we are opposing this amendment.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I gather from the way you recognize me that you are less than

enthusiastic about the continuation of this fine debate. I think it is one of the best ones we have had in this House since this afternoon. However, I wanted to be sure you had the benefit of my personal experience in this connection.

I am one of the farmers described by my colleague the member for Kent-Elgin who grows corn and soybeans. In fact, the availability of futures contracts removes some of the gamble in what I, my wife and family are undertaking on our 100 hectares. The prices of the corn and beans in our market depend almost exclusively on what happens in the Chicago grain exchanges.

Many people in this House and in this country somehow think of Canada as the great breadbasket for the hungry world. We should be aware that Canada produces three per cent of the grain in the world, that all of Canada—

Mr. Chairman: Stay on topic.

Mr. Nixon: All right, I have already told you this, but I have not told everybody.

The state of Iowa grows more grain than all of Canada put together. We have some strange idea this commodities futures exchange to be established downtown in some boardroom in the new skyscraper the Toronto Stock Exchange is building is going to have very much to do with prices. I think we are really off track. If we wanted to object to something we might well object to the effect the Chicago grain exchange has had on our prices where the Moguls, so graphically described by the socialist on our left, perhaps have from time to time had an unwarranted effect on the prices.

Mr. Chairman, do not fool with your gavel.

Mr. Chairman: Okay.

Mr. Nixon: They have had an unwarranted effect and influence on the prices that we long-suffering farmers have had to contend with. The only thing that has provided the least bit of buoyancy in the market we are now in—that is for anybody smart enough to hold over his or her corn or soybeans, and I am not in that group, I am sorry to say.

Mr. Breagh: We would have known that without the confession.

Mr. Nixon: Right, but the only thing that has provided any buoyancy is once again an initiative by the government of the United States with a program that they call the payment in kind program.

I know, Mr. Chairman, that you will not want me to spend a lot of time talking about that, although you have permitted a full range of discussion as to why the Premier (Mr. Davis) did

not run for the federal leadership. That did not seem to faze you so I know you can stand a moment or two of this. It is directly associated with the importance of the establishment of a futures exchange here in Toronto.

The payment in kind program established in the United States is a result of the American federal government buying, particularly in corn surpluses, over the last few years. This is an effort to maintain the world price of corn for American farmers.

Any buoyancy we have had has not been a result of any initiative by the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Timbrell) in Ontario or any other minister of agriculture that I know of offhand. Instead, the prices, depressed though they have been, have been maintained at that level because of the initiative of the government of the United States. They have bought millions of bushels of corn, put them in storage at public expense and they decided, and I really congratulate them for this sort of initiative, that they were going have to phase this out. They put forward a program to the corn farmers of the United States saying, "If you will not plant an acre of corn, we will give you the amount of corn you would have grown for nothing." That is out of the corn the government has bought and is storing.

This has resulted in a decrease of 20 per cent in the acreage to be planted, much of it already planted. Of course, the futures exchanges, realizing the amount of corn being grown is reduced, immediately responded by raising the future prices and that affected our price here. Therefore, the so-called payment in kind program of the United States has a dramatic effect here.

On the other hand, we are very much the tail of the grain-producing dog in that respect. We can take advantage of world prices but we have little influence on world prices unless we find ourselves in a political circumstance where the President of the United States says to Russia and lots of other countries, "We do not like you because of what you are doing in Afghanistan"—or some equally far-fetched argument to make the farmers suffer—"and we will not sell you any grain."

In those instances, on some occasions it is possible then for Canada to take advantage of an artificially skewed American market. But as far as we are concerned in our own farm operation, we sell up to 50 per cent of our crop in advance to a local grain dealer. It happens to be a branch of a fairly large company, an international company, but we do business with

it and we have a great deal of confidence in the people who handle the local office.

Sometimes I feel I make a mistake not doing more business with small grain dealers because most of them are good supporters of mine, at least they have been until they read what I am saying. We must be aware many of them are trying to get into the future grain market business and they deserve a good deal of credit because they are full of initiative and they provide a tremendous service to the farm community.

The only place I have some agreement with the finger shakers and the quiverers from the socialist party is when there is some idea that some few cents from each one of the contracts I enter into with some local grain dealer is going to be skimmed off for some approval of a marketing supervising bureaucracy here in Toronto on the 32nd floor of the new Toronto Stock Exchange. There will be some people who have nothing whatsoever to do with the cultivation of the land skimming off some sort of ridiculous fee, supposedly a professional fee, that is simply going to reduce our profits.

I believe there will be substantial safeguards, however, established for the farmers and for the grain dealers on both sides. I suppose that as long as one is dealing with a company as large as Cargill, which I believe is the largest in the world and now has offices in most areas of Ontario, probably there is no fear that the farmer is going to be taken, in some financial way, on the delivery or the storage of the grain. However, it is quite true that smaller operators, with the very best of intentions, find themselves six months or a year down the road unable to fulfil their commitments. This has happened in the past and I believe certain safeguards are necessary.

I would also say that, rather than sit back and let the grain Moguls of the Chicago Stock Exchange dictate all the prices and policy and remove any profit that is in that aspect of the business, we might as well have our share of it here. As the former member for High Park, Dr. Morton Shulman, pointed out repeatedly in this House, anybody who is not dabbling in the futures market is somehow stupid and all one has to do is do what he does and make a million. I tend to do what he does about six months late, that is the only thing wrong. However, one of these times, my ship is going to come in.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Chairman, I listened with interest to the comments from the member for Kent-Elgin and also the member for Brant-

Oxford-Norfolk (Mr. Nixon). I do bear in mind the fact they are practising farmers, or have been in the past, and that my profession, my trade, has been otherwise.

However, I would like to bring to the members' attention the fact this is not a simple market which has been created just for people who want to get some security against the risks of farming with respect to their crop between the spring when they plant and the fall when they are going to collect it. This is a market which can deal, and on which people are entitled to deal, in all forms of commodities. I think perhaps the House would be interested in knowing just how wide that actually happens to be.

8:50 p.m.

The definition of commodities is actually in the Commodity Futures Act which this House adopted a few years ago. It says, "Commodity" means, whether in the original or a processed state, any agricultural product, forest product, product of the sea, mineral, metal, hydrocarbon fuel, currency or precious stone or other gem, and any goods, article, service, right or interest, or class thereof, designated as a commodity under the regulations."

I have not had the opportunity to peruse the regulations at great length, but I think some of my friends from the Liberal Party may have and maybe my former colleague from High Park knows them well as well.

I would like to point out the purport of that definition is that any manufactured product of any kind would qualify. Any type of processed, as well as unprocessed, food and any type of processed, as well as unprocessed, naphtha products would qualify.

The reference to service can be defined under the regulations. To take a perhaps ridiculous example, this means one could have an option about how much it is going to cost in five years' time to send a kid to university, or to have day care for an infant to protect one's self against that kind of a risk.

I said earlier what I thought was wrong was the sense of values in terms of the kinds of things this government gives priority to. We have already had a bill on commodity futures. It seems to have given the Ontario Securities Commission ample powers to permit the Toronto Stock Exchange to clone or spawn the futures exchange, or something very similar to it, without reference back to the Legislature in terms of this particular legislation.

For example, the futures exchange that is

being created here will have the power to have futures in interest rates, if that is provided for under the regulations. It will certainly have power to have futures in such commodities as gold and silver. My friend the member for Welland-Thorold has given me some comments here about a teasing article by Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner and Smith, the thundering herd, with respect to the kinds of gains speculators can make by speculating in gold futures.

They say, "Consider the profit potential demonstrated by precious metal futures in 1979." That must have been a good year because they used it as an example.

"During the year, the 1979 gold futures contract advanced from \$237 to \$510 an ounce. The dollar value of this range was about \$27,000 per contract. The margin to contract ranged from \$2,000 to \$8,000." In other words, by putting down \$2,000 one might have made \$27,000. That is a heck of a long way from the kinds of modest services to the farmer performed by speculators as the member for Kent-Elgin was talking about when he talked about a farmer trying to protect himself against the price fluctuations toward the end of the year. In the case of silver, the gain per contract could have been as much as \$100,000 in 1979, and the amount of money that was actually required to be put down was \$1,500.

Those are futures. When it comes to options, the fact is the amount required in terms of margins is a good deal less again. Therefore, we should probably put it under the Ontario Racing Commission and suggest a 14 per cent or 15 per cent parimutuel tax be exacted on this kind of trading by the government of Ontario on behalf of the people. That is the kind of business it happens to be.

It was interesting to me, looking at some high roller who said he was going to come back into the commodities market here in Ontario after he was kicked out by the OSC back in 1977 that, according to an article by Jim Foster in the *Toronto Star* in February, two-thirds of the people who buy commodity options, who choose to speculate that way, lose their investment within six months.

That is a long way from the kind of simple risk hedging described by the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk and by the member for Kent-Elgin. This is speculation, pure and simple. It is speculation in commodities that have nothing to do with the forest, the fields and other natural resources we have here in Canada. It is, as I said

earlier, a form of the purest kind of finance capitalism.

I suppose there may be people who sit in their beds, like John Maynard Keynes used to do back in the 1930s, speculating in currency futures on behalf of King's College, Cambridge, and also on his own account. In an hour and a half he managed to secure both a personal fortune and the fortune of that college. I suppose there are people like that.

I do not happen to think it a particularly useful type of function, and that is why we are objecting to this bill as a whole and to subsection 4(1) which defines the objects of the exchange in such broad terms that almost anything could, under the regulation, be subject to legitimate gambling without even being taxed by the Ontario government on the Toronto Futures Exchange.

Mr. McGuigan: Mr. Chairman, certainly there are cases where people have got into the market purely on a speculative basis and have made large amounts of money. The old story is when they go to the race track, they never tell about the races they lose. The statistic that is widely quoted in the commodities business is that 70 per cent of the people who go in to speculate lose their money.

I would like to submit this is generally beneficial to the primary producers because, when people go in to speculate, they generally go on the positive side of the market. There is a negative side and a positive side. Because we always like to think prices are going to go up, we tend to go in on the positive side and those people who are speculating generally buy in at a future price.

There are very few people who go in and do what is called selling short. Those are the people who believe that six months down the road the price will be much lower than it is today. They might look at the grain market and say: "Look, the grain market is overpriced. We are paying these farmers too much money. I believe six months down the road I can buy grain for 50 per cent less. Therefore, I will sell grain at a low price."

They go in and make a quote into the market for six months from now to sell grain at a low price, betting or hoping that when that contract comes due the actual cash market will be down lower. They will buy from the cash market and they will make a profit on the difference between the cash market and that commodity market at its expiry date.

They assume a great risk when they do that

because they are gambling about what happens to crops on the other side of the world. We must remember in the other hemisphere there are crops coming off at the opposite time of the year, and we must remember in the warmer climates of the world there are crops coming off any time of the year because there is no difference between winter and summer. There are rice crops, and rice is one of the huge commodities in the grain market. It is now second to corn and not too long ago it was first. They are gambling on what happens six months down the road out in those fields all over the world.

If there should happen to be a real shortage, if a disease or drought comes along, and they gamble wrongly on agreeing that six months from now they are going to sell so many thousands of bushels at a price, they could be scrambling out in the market to cover that sale and their losses know no limit. They may have agreed to put a figure on it that next fall they will sell corn for \$2 a bushel because they think the price of corn is going to go down. Instead, there is a huge shortage next fall. They have to come up with that corn at \$2 and they might have to pay \$10 for it. There is a huge risk in selling short.

There is not nearly the risk in being long because, if they said the price was \$3, the maximum they could lose on any contract if the price went down to zero would be \$3; assuming the price went right down to nothing, they could not lose any more than \$3. But if they sold short, the losses they could suffer would really be unlimited. The result of this is that very few people sell short, and it is on a short sale that the terrible things our friends are talking about happen to primary producers. So I would submit that most of what happens in the market is on the positive side and helps the primary producers.

9 p.m.

There are dangers in setting up a market. We certainly would not want to set up a market for a commodity that is handled in very small quantities. If it is a very small quantity, there is a terrible danger that with a little bit of money and manipulation someone could get a good-sized portion of that market. We do not want to handle that sort of situation. We want, of course, to have the safeguards we have already talked about.

I do have certain fears about options, because about a year ago a young constituent came to me who had been sold options by a high-priced

boiler-room type of salesman in the commission market. The person who had bought the options was in no position to take that kind of gamble. He lost, of course, as most people do in those situations, and it put him in a very bad state of affairs.

I would submit that any salesman who would force options on a person or would even sell options to a person in that sort of situation is one who has absolutely no ethics, and surely I would think that under our regulatory process something could be done with that kind of operation. But again, we are responsible to some extent for our own mistakes, and one does not do those sorts of things a second time.

But I want to emphasize that in general one can make a very good argument, and I think it can be backed up by the facts, that people who speculate in the market generally contribute to that market. I do not mind a bit taking money from a doctor or a lawyer or anybody else who thinks he is going to get rich off me. I do not mind taking his money one bit.

Motion agreed to.

Section 4, as amended, agreed to.

Sections 5 and 6, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 7:

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Mitchell moves that clause 7(1)(b) of the bill be struck out and the following substituted therefor: "(b) Two public directors or, where the bylaws so provide, up to four public directors."

Mr. Mitchell: Mr. Chairman, this is to ensure that there is adequate public participation in the decision-making process in the exchange.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Chairman, I recall that when we were looking at this legislation earlier on there was some discussion of an increased opportunity for public directors beyond those persons who were particularly involved in the exchange itself.

I would like to hear from the parliamentary assistant as to the immediate plans. If we are to have two public directors now and eight others, so that the total number of the governors would be 10, perhaps he could advise us if the intention is to increase that now to 12; or just how we are to have this legislation available, whether or not it is going to be used immediately with respect to the increase in the number of public directors.

Mr. Mitchell: I stand to be corrected, but my understanding is it will be governed by a board of directors of 11, which may be expanded to 13 at the request of the Ontario Securities Com-

mission. My understanding is they must be appointed by the Lieutenant Governor by order in council. Five of the directors will be elected by the trading members, three directors will be elected by the Toronto Stock Exchange, which is the sponsor member, and two public directors are to be approved by the Lieutenant Governor in Council, and that number is expandable to four. The president is appointed by the rest of the board after nomination by the TSE.

Mr. Breithaupt: I was incorrect when I said 10. I should have said 11 at that point, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate that explanation, and I presume this opportunity for increase is something that is going to depend upon the experience of the board as it sorts itself out and develops over the next several years.

We have been given at least the option in legislation and it is certainly one we welcome. I think a balanced public interest of not 50 per cent, but something more than just two of 11 is a good idea. We have been given that opportunity and I look forward at least to a consideration after a year of operation of this and some statement or comment in estimates, if not otherwise, by the minister or the parliamentary assistant as the case may be, as to how things are sorting out and whether the positive requirement for additional public directors is seen as a useful result of the experience of the governors.

Mr. Mitchell: In response to the question raised by the member, I can say without question that the minister would be pleased to keep him aware of what is happening and how the futures exchange has been operating and whether there has been proven to be the need to expand to the additional two directors. I am sure he will be able and only too happy to provide all that information.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Chairman, this bill does not have any kind of a sunset clause. It is interesting that when it is something that serves the needs of the financial community sunset clauses seem to get forgotten. When it is something that serves the needs of the people, the Minister of Industry and Trade (Mr. Walker) and people of his temper of mind within the government party seem to be very keen to put an end to it within a very short time.

With respect to this subsection, I would like to point out for the record exactly what the process is concerning the so-called public directors. It is true that the public directors cannot be trading in futures and cannot be members of the stock exchange, nor can they be associates or

insiders of members of the exchange, if I remember correctly; however, to call them entirely public is a misnomer.

In order to become a public director of the Toronto Futures Exchange there are no fewer than four hurdles of acceptance that must be passed. In the first place, the candidates must be recommended by a nominating committee that contains at least two people, the president of the futures corporation and the president of the Toronto Stock Exchange. I would suspect that those people are not guilty of too many heresies with respect to the interest of the futures exchange. They are not likely to get somebody to oppose them, who is going to rock the boat too far as a public director.

The second hurdle is they have to get by the president of the corporation and the president of the Toronto Stock Exchange, and maybe somebody else from the nominating committee as well.

The third hurdle is that the nomination has got to be accepted or approved by the cabinet and by the Lieutenant Governor in Council. We all know how these things work. It would be ludicrous to think that the cabinet as a whole sits around and scratches its collective ears and decides at length on every such appointment. There is a patronage secretary or an appointments secretary or somebody like that who works close to the Premier and whose job it is to vet those kinds of appointments if that is what is required in the legislation, or in fact to dig into his or her files and find appropriate people to be appointed to these kinds of quasi-public positions if there is not a matter of approving somebody else's nomination.

Therefore, somebody who works for the Premier and whose job among other things is to make sure that friends of the Conservative Party are kept happy and get their due share of the rewards or spoils of office, has the responsibility to look over the recommendation coming from the president of the stock exchange and the president of the Toronto futures corporation.

Of course, it is not my experience that the mindset of those particular individuals is going to be that much different from the mindset of somebody who makes appointments or proposes appointments on behalf of the Lieutenant Governor in Council.

Then the matter has to pass a fourth hurdle, which is that it actually has to go through the cabinet, although that is basically a formality. The Premier says, "Look, my guys say it is okay." The cabinet says, "Fine," and it is done.

When we have passed that fourth hurdle there is to be a fifth hurdle. The fifth hurdle is that after all this is done we do not even have an appointment. All we have is a nomination of a public director or two and, according to subsection 8(3), the public directors will then be elected annually by the board of directors. In other words, the public directors have to be acceptable to the president, to the chairman of the stock exchange, to somebody who works near the Premier, to the cabinet and to all of their other fellow directors.

Those people are meant to represent the interests of the public and make sure the futures exchange is not forgetting it has responsibilities to the public at large. It has a responsibility to small investors who may choose to have a little fling on the speculative market in commodities and options. It has a responsibility to make sure that crooks or near-crooks do not gain a haven in the financial markets of Ontario by being able to play in the futures market.

But the people who are there to keep the futures exchange honest on behalf of all of us must, in fact, run that gauntlet, possibly every year, I am not quite sure, in order to get appointed or reappointed.

It is my understanding that if it comes to a conflict between some big general idea of public wellbeing or public good, and pleasing the people who are responsible for one to stay in that particular office—who either name that person, propose that person or validate the nomination—one is more likely to look to those people who have the control over whether that person can keep on coming back, maybe who have control over the per diems that person receives for doing the job—maybe it is an honorific post, I do not know and it does not particularly matter—but it seems to me that these public directors are public in name only and in fact they do not genuinely represent the public.

I would have liked to have seen this government take perhaps a radical point of view, but look around to see whether there were not some other people or groups representative of the people of Ontario who might be appropriately asked to make nominations to the futures exchange, and then strip away all of this other business of three or four levels of approval before they could get in.

It would be interesting if the Catholic bishops of Ontario, to take one example, could be asked to make one nomination to represent the public on the Toronto Futures Exchange; it would be

interesting if the Ontario Federation of Labour could be asked to make one nomination of a public-spirited individual to be a representative on the Toronto Futures Exchange; it would be interesting if the Ontario Public Interest Research Group, which has done some excellent work, mainly through the universities, could be asked to make a nomination of a third public director to the Toronto Futures Exchange.

One can think of other groups. Perhaps the association of mayors and municipalities, or the Association of Municipalities of Ontario, could be asked to make an appointment. Who knows where one might find some possible, legitimate sources in this society. Perhaps—and I think this would be a good idea—the Ontario Federation of Agriculture would be one since obviously its members, as has been argued by the member for Kent-Elgin (Mr. McGuigan), do have some interest in there being some modest amount of futures trading taking place in Ontario.

There are just four suggestions for legitimate nominators of public directors who would be perceived by the public much more obviously as being public and working in the public interest than this kind of system the government has come up with.

Whether we vote against it or not does not particularly matter. What is important now is to put some ideas on the record. I say to the parliamentary assistant and his minister that I intend to pursue this matter since I am now critic on of financial and commercial affairs. There is a real question of legitimacy in terms of many of the institutions that govern our society.

If we were the government, we would be making the kinds of changes I suggest. Were we not in a position to change the institutions outright, we would seek to try to change them so that they would genuinely reflect the public interest and not just the interests of self-serving interest groups, which seems to be the government's idea of how these things ought to operate.

I have begun to do some thinking about the kinds of institutions we need in our society, looking ahead perhaps 10 or 20 years. It may not be possible to change or transform those institutions entirely, but it should be possible to find ways of reflecting the public interest, the interests of employees and workers, consumers and owners of capital in the various institutions that make up our very complex and prolific economy.

We should be looking towards that kind of thing rather than seeing a situation where there is a continuing and increasing polarization, where poor farmers, for example, feel, perhaps

unlike some of the Liberal representatives of farmers in the Legislature, that their interests are no longer being served by the institutions that have bankrupted them with high interest rates, Liberal interest rates; unlike the situation where consumers find themselves increasingly radicalized and turned off by the lack of protection they get in the marketplace, unlike the situation where workers grow more and more fearful because of the increasing number of toxic substances that are used almost wantonly by their employers and they have no effective powers to fight back and make sure their work place is a healthy, safe and decent kind of a place.

We can change that. We should be talking about changing that. In this province, the Premier (Mr. Davis) is never without a quip about how we are the finest—

Mr. Chairman: Getting back to the section.

Mr. Cassidy: —the richest, the most progressive province in Canada, in North America, let alone the world. He is wrong about that. None the less, we do have some opportunities in this society to experiment with ways in which the interests of the whole society and not just particular interests can be represented.

I would say to the parliamentary assistant very seriously that when he is drafting this kind of bill and looking at the public interest, for goodness' sake do not let the stock exchange and people there define what they think is the public interest. Have some independence for once and look at the public interest in terms of all the people of the province.

Mr. Mitchell: Mr. Chairman, I would like to take a couple of moments to reply to the member for Ottawa Centre. The minister and I, when I was taking the Business Corporations Act through committee, gave a commitment to attempt to resolve an issue raised by the member's caucus, that is, the independence of one third of the board of directors. I assure the member that the sort of thing he is talking about is being looked after.

I should point out that the Toronto Stock Exchange has had public governors for 14 years. It is my understanding they have consistently proven that they are public representatives. Election in this Toronto Futures Exchange is going to be identical to that which is carried out within the Toronto Stock Exchange.

Mr. Cassidy: Election is by the existing board, which means it is self-perpetuating. There are a couple of controls in the sense there is a

nomination from outside, but it is only from down the hall in the office of the chairman of the exchange and the president of the futures exchange. While there is some kind of rubber stamp that comes here, the most that can be done there is that the Lieutenant Governor in Council and the Premier's people will ensure that it is a Conservative public director rather than, God forbid, somebody who happens to have Liberal connections or perhaps even be nonpartisan—or even, my God, somebody who had been active in some way with the New Democratic Party. Those are the kinds of controls.

9:20 p.m.

I would suggest that something a good deal more vigorous might be experimented with here. The Toronto Futures Exchange is brand new. It does not have, I dare say, the type of reputation and perhaps the goodwill that has been built up or the traditions that have been built up by the Toronto Stock Exchange, which has, after all, been around for a long time. But I would also remind the minister that it has had its share of scandals and problems within, as well as prior to, the last 14 years.

This question should be looked at more seriously than to say, "We will do something about seeing that at least one third of the directors in each corporation are independent of the corporation, that is, are not directly affiliated financially with it." That is not good enough.

Mr. Chairman: We have all heard the amendment to the section. All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion the ayes have it.

Motion agreed to.

On section 8:

Mr. Mitchell: Mr. Chairman, I propose an amendment to subsection 8(5).

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Mitchell moves that subsection 8(5) of Bill 7 be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

"No person shall be elected as a public director unless the person's nomination for election is approved by the Lieutenant Governor in Council on the recommendation of a nominating committee constituted in accordance with the bylaws and co-chaired by the president of the corporation and the president of the Toronto Stock Exchange."

Mr. Chairman: The member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. Cassidy: I am happy to yield, as the member of the Liberal Party intended to go first.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Chairman, in looking at this amendment, it would appear that instead of having the joint recommendation of two persons who are going to be particularly involved in the operation at the exchange, there is now a general nominating committee which will take that place.

The co-chairmen of that committee are going to be the two persons otherwise represented, but I would like to hear from the parliamentary assistant as to the makeup and numbers of persons expected to be on this nominating committee.

I agree with the comments made by the member for Ottawa Centre concerning the hurdles, as he referred to them, for a public representative to become a member of the governors of this exchange. It is important we ensure the public members of this group are seen to be readily and clearly appointed without any difficulty that might occur by the filtering process that may develop in the hierarchy of steps that has to be followed under the present system.

I would like to hear as to the strength and background of this nominating committee to ensure the process is as open as possible, realizing the ultimate requirement of any of these appointments by order of the Lieutenant Governor in Council is a decision by cabinet that has clear political overtones involved along with the responsibility and abilities of the persons to be nominated.

Mr. Mitchell: I do not have the exact makeup of the nominating committee, as the chairman will note by the amendment. It is a nominating committee as structured under the bylaws of the exchange.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Chairman, what that means, in effect, is it would probably perpetuate the idea of a self-perpetuating board. The nominating committee would likely be struck from the existing board of directors, except for the fact that the president of the Toronto Stock Exchange would become a co-chairperson of the nominating committee with the president of the Toronto futures corporation.

I have basically made the comments I wanted to make on this item. This is not a means by which we get public directors; this is a means by which we get directors who are in harmony with respect to the way they view the world and with respect to their social, class and financial back-

ground with the people who will be the directors of the Toronto Futures Exchange.

The only difference between the public directors appointed by this process and the directors who are elected by the members of the exchange as a whole will be the fact that they are not directly involved as participants in or as members of the TSE or the TFE. That is the only difference. Apart from that, nothing at all is different.

We are going to oppose this section. I could have spoken perhaps a minute or two ago on subsection 8(3), pointing out that—

Mr. Boudria: But you didn't.

Mr. Cassidy: No, I didn't, because in the interests of seeing this whole committee stage through—

Mr. Chairman: I will give you a minute now.

Mr. Cassidy: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was pointing out there that, rather than have the public directors elected by the board of directors, which means they are a self-perpetuating kind of thing, they should be selected by some outside body and appointed to the Toronto Futures Exchange if they are to have any genuine independence at all.

With respect to this section, for the reasons I have given before, we do not think these are public directors at all; and if the government's idea of the public interest is this and nothing else, then they are pretty poor protectors of the public interest.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Chairman, just to follow through on the comments made so far, it seems to me the amendment we are bringing in could be seen to be insubstantial in that, if the two persons referred to are the nominating committee, we really have not changed anything. We have said that A and B will make a joint recommendation in the subsection as it was printed; now we are saying there is a nominating committee which shall be chaired by A and B. Of course, they could be, in fact, the nominating committee with no other additions, so I want to make sure we are not giving the appearance of a broader nominating committee and not just really subverting it and keeping it the way it was.

I do think we should hear what the expected bylaws are going to be as to the size and makeup of this nominating committee, because I think it is important that it be done quite clearly with expectations of involvement now rather than replacing two persons with a committee chaired by two persons who may be not much of a replacement.

Mr. Mitchell: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to assure the member for Kitchener, and I think I can do this in all honesty, although I cannot—and I say this quite directly—give him the precise numbers, that it most definitely will be made up of the president of the corporation, the chairman of the Toronto Stock Exchange and several members; but I am unable to give the honourable member that number at this time. I think I can assure him it will be broader than just the two members. In fact, part of the rationale is to broaden the nominating committee.

Mr. Chairman: All those in favour of Mr. Mitchell's motion will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion the ayes have it.

9:30 p.m.

Mr. Cassidy: The Liberal Party voted nay and members of our party voted nay.

An hon. member: They voted aye.

Mr. Cassidy: They voted aye, did they? I beg your pardon. They were together, just like this afternoon. Okay. Thank you.

Section 8, as amended, agreed to.

Sections 9 and 10 agreed to.

On section 11:

The Acting Chairman (Mr. Stevenson): Mr. Mitchell moves that subsection 11(2) of the bill be amended by striking out "a member" in the third line and inserting in lieu thereof "any person or company of a class referred to in the bylaw."

Motion agreed to.

Section 11, as amended, agreed to.

Section 12 agreed to.

On section 13:

The Acting Chairman: Mr. Mitchell moves that section 13 of the bill be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

"13. The corporation may acquire by purchase, lease or otherwise and may hold for any period of time any land or interest therein, whether or not such land or interest is necessary for its actual use or occupation or for carrying on its undertaking, and may sell, charge, lease or otherwise deal with or dispose of such land or any interest therein."

Mr. Mitchell: I have just a brief explanation, Mr. Chairman. As members know, the Toronto Stock Exchange is moving to new quarters and the Toronto Futures Exchange will be a part of that new facility. The purpose of this is to ensure that the Toronto Futures Exchange, together

with the Toronto Stock Exchange, has the corporate power to participate in the development of its new premises in downtown Toronto.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Chairman, I find this amendment more difficult. The commodity futures exchange is to be a body without share capital, and it is to be a body that does not have the purpose of making a profit, interestingly enough. In fact, in section 5 it says, "The corporation shall be carried on without the purpose of gain for its members, and any profits or other accretions to the corporation shall be used in promoting its object." Its object, as we went through before, is to provide for the operation of a commodity futures or futures options exchange. It is a rather narrow type of purpose.

The difference between the amendment and the original section is that, in addition to buying and holding property, it says the corporation may sell or dispose of it. If you are going to buy it, I suppose you have to be able to get rid of it. What bothers me, though, is that the original subsection of the original section allowed the corporation to acquire land or interests in land, whether or not such land or interest was necessary for its actual use or occupation.

I begin to ask myself what the devil we are doing that for. Why is it that the futures exchange is being put in a position where, having no share capital of its own, it can effectively speculate in land or in interests in land and property—basically in office buildings, but it could buy a mine in northern Ontario, I suppose, if it felt like it—for which it had absolutely no purpose at all and for which it had absolutely no need at all? The minister's parliamentary assistant may say: "It is not likely to do that." My response to that would be: "If it is not likely to do that, why the devil give it the power?"

Perhaps, before I continue, the parliamentary assistant could explain why on earth those words have been put in, because if they stay in, we are going to oppose this section. I do not see why we should create some type of monster which (a) is there to encourage speculation and (b) has been empowered by the Legislature, and does not have to pay corporation tax or meet other obligations that other corporations have to do, to speculate in property itself.

Mr. Mitchell: Mr. Chairman, I should point out that the Toronto Futures Exchange is going to be a participant in this development in downtown Toronto. There have been some requirements that the stock exchange has had to

meet in being able to acquire the building and move into it.

I cannot give the member all the ins and outs of that. Suffice it to say that I think the basic premise behind this motion is to allow the Toronto Futures Exchange to acquire premises larger than it currently needs so it will have them available as it grows.

Mr. McGuigan: Mr. Chairman, a similar situation comes to mind. I do not know whether I have the correct name of the act but I believe it is the Ontario Food Terminal Act which governs and runs the food terminal on the Queensway. The food terminal was built some time in the early 1950s, not too many years after the Second World War, to accommodate the fresh fruit and vegetable market, and it replaced the old St. Lawrence Market in downtown Toronto.

It was not too long after they were operating that they realized the thing was such a success that it was expanding and needed more land. I cannot give the members the date or anything of that sort, but it was probably about 20 years ago that they bought land north of Toronto. I think it is somewhere up around Highway 400, and it was to be used for future expansion. They held that land for a number of years, but the pressure to expand became less, and the efficiency at the food terminal became greater as they moved to bigger trucks and handling equipment, faster movement through the terminal and so on.

A couple of years ago or so they sold that property at a big profit and reinvested the money back into the food terminal. The Premier (Mr. Davis) was out there about a year ago. There were a lot of pictures taken with him and the then Minister of Agriculture and Food opening up the new section of the terminal. Instead of expanding the area horizontally, they went vertical. They put parking garages and a number of facilities on several layers.

I suppose without that provision one could have argued at any time during the period that they held land that really was not required. Of course, events might have been different if they had lost money on the holding of that land rather than making money. But, in either event, the intent when they bought it was to take care of future expansion as they felt they were going to be forced out of that area of Toronto. However, that did not happen. One could have argued in the interval that they had land that was not required for their operation.

Unless there is something devious in here that all of us are missing—and I certainly would not

want to be any part of such a plot—I do not have any trouble supporting this section.

9:40 p.m.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Chairman, this section empowers the Toronto Futures Exchange to purchase and acquire the farm that currently belongs to the member for Kent-Elgin. That is what it does.

If, for example, it had said, "The corporation may acquire any land or interest therein which is necessary for its actual use or occupation, but which may be required for its future use, and may sell"—

Mr. Mitchell: Carrying on its business; carrying on its business.

Mr. Cassidy: That is right. "Which is necessary for its actual use or which may be necessary for its future use."

Mr. Mitchell: But it is very specific—"in carrying out its business."

Mr. Cassidy: No. It says it may acquire now, whether or not that land or interest is necessary. In other words, it is directly the opposite. Perhaps the parliamentary assistant would like to explain.

Mr. Mitchell: As I tried to point out, the Toronto Futures Exchange is moving into the new building in a partnership, one could say, with the Toronto Stock Exchange. This section, I am assured by the staff as well, is purely to allow them to acquire space which is perhaps larger than they can immediately use but which will be there when the need definitely arises. It is for nothing any more sinister than that. I find the amendment quite clear when it says, "necessary for its actual use or occupation or for carrying on its undertaking."

Mr. Cassidy: I say to the parliamentary assistant, since his staff have assured him of that, why on earth does the section not say that? We have a problem in this House with legislation that is drafted and goes through the legislative committee of the government, giving powers we should not be giving. Surely the futures exchange does not want the farm of the member for Kent-Elgin. I understand that.

There is nothing particularly wrong, if we are going to have the damned thing, with the futures exchange acquiring a bit of extra space in the new stock exchange building to accommodate future expansion. There is nothing particularly wrong with that either. There is no reason why the legislation could not say that.

What I would like to propose is that by

agreement we stand down the subsection, we stand down the committee stage, we go and do a couple of the bills the parliamentary assistant wanted to get through tonight, and then he can come back with an amended section which says what he tells us he wanted to do. That would make an awful lot more sense than saying, "Well, we know it is sloppy, we know we were wrong, but we are going to bull it through because we have the votes."

Mr. Mitchell: Mr. Chairman, with respect, I do not intend to stand the bill—

Mr. Nixon: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman: If you will permit me, I want to bring to your attention that the Globe and Mail of tomorrow's date, printed tonight, contains substantial detail of information purported to come from the budget to be presented to this House next Tuesday.

The basis of all the objections on any budgetary leak—and this is apparently a leak of many of the important budgetary documents—is that the rights and privileges of members of the House are transgressed.

Since the House is in committee and it is not your responsibility to respond to a point of privilege of this importance, I would move that the committee rise so that the matter can be brought to the attention of Mr. Speaker without delay.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, I am sure we are all very concerned with the story that is purported to be in the Globe. I have not seen the paper; I gather my friends have it over there. I am sure it would bother all of us, but I do not think it behooves any of us to discuss it in detail at this time without the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) here or any other members here at the present time.

I would have to say we should continue with the business of this House until we have a chance—

Mr. Elston: No. There is a motion on the floor.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I am suggesting the committee not rise and report. I am suggesting the committee continue on.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order: It is very clear. Standing order 85(a) says, "A motion that the Chairman leave the chair is always in order, takes precedence of any other motion, and is not debatable."

The whole point is that the matter should be brought to the attention of the Speaker without delay. I suggest the government would be ill

advised to stand in the way of such a report to Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: While the rule appears to be pre-emptory, it would not be the first time that a pre-emptory rule of this House did not quite mean what it said. If there is a problem about the meaning of that rule—and I doubt that anybody in this House knows anything other than what it says—I suggest it may be appropriate to recess the committee for 15 minutes to allow the Chairman to consult about the matter.

Mr. Chairman: I would like to do that. I will leave the chair for 10 minutes. The House will resume at 10 o'clock.

The committee recessed at 9:47 p.m.

10:05 p.m.

Mr. Chairman: At this point, I would like to thank the member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick) for encouraging me to leave the chair for 10 or 15 minutes to re-evaluate the chair's position on the motion made by the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk (Mr. Nixon). I would like to thank all members for their patience.

Under reading of standing order 85(a), I have no choice but to accept the motion. The motion is not debatable. As a result, I will accept the motion that the chair now rise and report to the Speaker.

All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye."

All those against will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the nays have it.

Call in the members.

11:23 p.m.

Mr. Chairman: Order. To refresh everyone's memory, I am dealing with the motion that has been brought forward by the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk under section 85(a) of our standing orders, that I do now rise and report.

The committee divided on Mr. Nixon's motion, which was agreed to on the following vote:

Ayes 90; nays 0.

On motion by Mr. Nixon, the committee of the whole House reported progress.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to your attention a matter—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Nixon: This is the first opportunity—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

The House adjourned at 11:26 p.m.

CONTENTS

Thursday, May 5, 1983

Committee of the whole House

Toronto Futures Exchange Act , Bill 7, Mr. Elgie, Mr. Breithaupt, Mr. Cassidy, Mr. McGuigan, Mr. Mitchell, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Swart, adjourned.	513
--	-----

Other business

Adjournment	529
------------------------------	-----

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Boudria, D. (Prescott-Russell L)
Breaugh, M. J. (Oshawa NDP)
Breithaupt, J. R. (Kitchener L)
Cassidy, M. (Ottawa Centre NDP)
Cureatz, S. L., Deputy Speaker and Chairman (Durham East PC)
Elston, M. J. (Huron-Bruce L)
McGuigan, J. F. (Kent-Elgin L)
Mitchell, R. C. (Carleton PC)
Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
Stevenson, K. R., Acting Chairman (Durham-York PC)
Swart, M. L. (Welland-Thorold NDP)
Turner, Hon. J. M., Speaker (Peterborough PC)
Wells, Hon. T. L., Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Scarborough North PC)



Hansard

Official Report of Debates

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Third Session, 32nd Parliament
Friday, May 6, 1983

Speaker: Honourable John M. Turner
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

Contents of the proceedings reported in this issue of Hansard appears at the back.

An alphabetical list of members of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario, together with lists of members of the executive council and the parliamentary assistants, also appears at the back as an appendix.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is \$15.00 per session, from: Hansard and Sessional Subscriptions, Publications Centre, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 965-2238.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Friday, May 6, 1983

The House met at 10 a.m.
Prayers.

BUDGET SECURITY

Mr. Peterson: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker: I know that an emergency debate has been filed with you for your consideration, but I also am very strongly of the view that this point of privilege is going to need a determination by you.

It regards what we consider to be one of the most serious breaches of privilege of members of this House, certainly in recent memory. I am of course referring to the publication in the first editions of today's *Globe and Mail* of an article revealing the purported contents of the 1983 Ontario budget of the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller). Apparently, the Treasurer has not denied that these are discarded budget documents, and this raises the very important question of accountability and, indeed, questions of honour and privilege.

At the outset, may I say that I believe there are three very important principles involved in this matter: the principle of budget secrecy, the principle of respect for the Legislature and the third principle of ministerial responsibility.

There is no question in the minds of the members of my party that the Treasurer personally is an honourable man. We are not suggesting for a moment that he in any way had a personal hand in this most unfortunate incident occurring. But we also know that there are conventions, there are rules and there are practices of this esteemed institution. Nothing historically has been more sacred than the secrecy surrounding the budget documents, and material that appears to have come from the budget has entered the public domain.

Security has very clearly been breached, and because of this breach we cannot be sure what other information may be available for people to use for their personal or institutional gain. Indeed, the entire budget process has been poisoned by this most unfortunate episode.

We have to ask ourselves why we have secrecy surrounding a budget. It started with a king who wanted to preserve fairness, the lack of advantage to any of his commoners as a result

of proposed changes in taxation. The purpose of secrecy was to tell all citizens at the same time what policies were to be changed so no one individual could take advantage.

Budget secrecy symbolizes that fairness, justice and the principle of respect for the Legislature and the privileges of the members therein. It symbolizes British fair play.

There are many precedents which deal with budget leaks such as this. In 1936, for example, the India Secretary in the British government disclosed an excise tax that would affect stock markets in advance of the budget release. He took the honourable course and resigned.

In 1947, the Chancellor of the British Exchequer, Hugh Dalton, told a reporter en route to the House of Commons that there was to be an excise tax increase on cigarettes. Even though this disclosure was made only moments before the budget was released, the minister resigned.

More recently, in Newfoundland in 1978, the Minister of Industrial Development and Rural Development made it known in advance of the budget that there would be no special support for regional hospitals. Although he only stated what was not going to be contained in the budget, he still took the honourable course and resigned.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Peterson: In each of the cases I have mentioned, the conventions of the British parliamentary traditions were adhered to and the minister resigned. They became questions of honour.

Beyond the many precedents, another important test is whether the information leaked could be of advantage to anyone. From the information disclosed in the *Globe and Mail* reports of today, it would appear that the material does affect the conduct of daily economic business in the province.

For example, the documents include figures on the funding provisions for the renter-buy program, the budget statistics and an indication of cuts in agriculture, industry and trade sectors, which have implications for many institu-

tions. Private lenders could take advantage of the information with respect to government-funded programs in evaluating the creditworthiness of individuals.

Indeed, the size of the deficit and the apparent move into the private market to finance has other implications in the financial area.

It has been pointed out by the parliamentary expert Eugene Forsey that the tradition of secrecy is based on the need to prevent people with prior knowledge of what is in the budget from making a "killing."

There is also a long-established principle that a Treasurer is responsible for security as well as the content.

As honourable members, as friends of the Treasurer we can all sympathize with his personal dilemma, but he has found himself in a most unfortunate position which has become for him a question of honour. We have had other Treasurers in the past who have found themselves in apparent conflicts of interest and who took the honourable course and voluntarily resigned without delay.

The Treasurer had the option of coming to the House last night at eight o'clock upon finding out of about these breaches. He chose to absent himself from the House and not take the members of this Legislature into his confidence with respect to the very serious breach.

In addition, members will note that no lesser person than the Treasurer himself has set the standard for public morality on this issue. There was a recent incident in Ottawa—I am sure members are aware of it—when the Minister of Finance there changed the figures. This Treasurer described it as "cute." He said, "Those of us in the business think it is a very serious problem."

He went on to say that the federal Minister of Finance then admitted his leak and did not wipe the slate clean. He said, "I thought the rules were such that you had to quit after that sort of thing."

Mr. Speaker, those are the words of the Treasurer of this House. I say to you sir, our privileges have been very seriously abused. It is going to call for you, sir, to make a judgement. You sit in sole judgement on this matter. It is a very weighty responsibility that you have. You have obviously been getting a great deal of advice in the past 12 or 14 hours. That being said, I call upon you to exercise your responsi-

bility with the great care it deserves in this situation.

10:10 a.m.

Mr. Speaker: The member for York South.

Hon. Mr. Eaton: We want a report on the BC election.

Mr. Rae: No, I am not going to talk about British Columbia this morning. I have more important items on my mind.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: Tell us about BC.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, it is a pity that the leader of the Liberal Party could not quote himself on the subject of Marc Lalonde. I think that is an irony we will all have to live with.

You have heard, sir, the basic arguments that have been set out for you with respect to the traditions on budget secrecy, ministerial accountability and the personal responsibility of the minister for what is taking place. I simply want to—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Rae: I hate to interrupt these personal quarrels, Mr. Speaker, but I wonder if I could just have your attention for a moment.

The arguments with respect to budget secrecy and ministerial responsibility are important, and I will make them to you very briefly, since they have been put to you.

The tradition with respect to the secrecy of the budget is crystal-clear. If I may say so, this tradition was respected even in its breach in the events we saw in Liberal Ottawa a short few weeks ago. The importance of that should not be lost to you.

The second major principle, which I think has to be recognized as equally important as the tradition of budget secrecy and which is fundamental not only to this Legislature but indeed also to the entire parliamentary tradition, is the principle of ministerial accountability and responsibility. It is a tough doctrine, in some respects it can be a rough master; but it is nevertheless the principle of our political and constitutional life which must be respected.

The principle is that in this instance the Treasurer is responsible for maintaining budget secrecy. The Treasurer is responsible from the time whatever thoughts he or his ministry may have with respect to the budget are first formed to the moment they are put on paper, to the moment they go from the Treasury to wherever the Treasurer decides to have it printed—he

can have it done in house or have it contracted out; that is his responsibility. He is responsible for all the security arrangements with respect to that budget. That is the personal responsibility of the Treasurer, and if information leaks out at any time during that entire process, during that continuum, it is the personal responsibility of the Treasurer for that leak.

Hon. Mr. Eaton: Even if it's stolen?

Mr. Rae: Now, I heard a comment from somebody else saying, "Even if it's stolen?" I would say that if it could be established—and I have not heard anything that would suggest this—that there had been a surreptitious break and enter and a direct theft of documents that no security arrangements could conceivably have prevented, then this House would want to listen to that evidence and would want to weigh it very carefully. I think that is a fair statement to make: I think we would all want to listen to it.

But I do not think the facts as we have heard them so far have disclosed that; and if the Treasurer is saying we have not heard all the facts, that is not our fault. We were here last night. Where was he? The Treasurer chose to be elsewhere and did not speak to the House about the events, and I am afraid we have to reach our judgements this morning on the basis of the information we have available thus far.

I want to make just one other point, Mr. Speaker. When you are considering this as a question of privilege, when you consider the basic test, which I suggest is, "Has the work of any member of this Legislature been impeded, been prevented?" I say that it has. In the normal course of events there would be a budget lockup, critics would be informed of the contents of the budget and we would be able to deal with those contents in an informed and reasoned way and to respond accordingly.

Each and every member would be able, on the basis of equal information, to communicate with his constituents on the contents of the budget. Members would be able to make whatever arguments, from different sides of the fence and from different points of view, they would with respect to the information that had been made available. I suggest, with a leak of this magnitude and of this proportion and the way in which it has been done, we have been prevented from doing our job in the way we are normally accustomed to doing our job.

Some hon. members: Come on.

Mr. Rae: No. I think that is a reasonable test. I suggest to the members that on the basis of that

test you are entitled, sir, to rule that this amounts to a breach of privilege and that the privileges of this House and of each and every member have been abused.

In that sense, sir, I want to suggest that you reflect a while on the arguments that have been put before you. I think we have a very basic problem here. In my view, the Treasurer should do the honourable thing; he should resign. The matter should be referred to a committee, and if that committee finds there was the kind of evidence I have suggested might be persuasive, then it is possible for us to look at the Treasurer's position again.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Rae: The budget process has been deeply tainted. The budget process now is thoroughly flawed. The budget cannot go ahead in its current form. If the Treasurer has the gall—

Interjections.

Mr. Rae: Wait for it.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Rotenberg: Hang him first and then have the trial. What kind of nonsense is that?

Mr. Rae: The member for Wilson Heights (Mr. Rotenberg) is getting excited.

Mr. Rotenberg: Come on, be fair; you started out well. Bad enough you want him to resign, but you want to hang him before the trial.

Mr. Foulds: You can get up later on a point of privilege.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Rae: If I may make this point again to you, Mr. Speaker, I suggest the budget process now is fundamentally flawed. For the Treasurer to say, as I heard him say this morning, that we do not know whether there is a leak and we will have to wait until Tuesday to see what is in the budget is an argument that is totally derivative of Marc Lalonde. That in itself makes it suspicious to me.

In addition, the Treasurer knows today whether there has been a leak, and he cannot pretend he does not know whether there has been a leak. For him to suggest that we will only know on Tuesday is an argument that does not hold water. The Treasurer is in a unique position to change the budget between now and Tuesday. I suggest that process would be completely improper in the light of everything that has taken place.

Mr. Speaker: I put to you the case, which I think is a reasonable case, that there has been a

fundamental breach of privilege. I think it can be shown that there are countless instances in our tradition where ministers have accepted personal responsibility. Even though it is a rough test, even though it is a tough test, it is a test that all of us must live by. None of us as individuals make the rules. We cannot make the rules as we go along in this place. The rules are there for the protection of everyone.

If sometimes they mete out a justice that seems a little hard in some circumstances, that is the way it has to be to protect the basic traditions of this place, to maintain the essentials of budget secrecy and to maintain the principle that a minister is responsible for what goes on in his jurisdiction and in his department. He must bear personal responsibility before us, as representatives of the citizens of this province, for sins of commission and for sins of omission as well.

10:20 a.m.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, we are speaking on a purported point of privilege. We are not engaged in a debate on whether the Treasurer should resign, whether there has been a budget leak or anything of that nature. We are discussing what the Leader of the Opposition stood up and said he was speaking on, a point of privilege.

We had a request for an emergency debate given to us last night. I have indicated to both parties we are agreeable to that debate. I submit the speeches we have had should properly be made in that emergency debate.

I will read from Parliamentary Privilege in Canada, by the former law clerk and parliamentary counsel to the House of Commons, at page 191 regarding "Privileges Concerns Member as Member, Not as Minister, Party Leader, Whip or Parliamentary Secretary." I will just read one paragraph, sir, because I am sure you are very familiar with this book:

"Furthermore, parliamentary privilege is concerned with the special rights of members, not in their capacity as ministers, or as party leaders, whips or parliamentary secretaries, but strictly in their capacity as members in their parliamentary work. Therefore, allegations of misjudgement or mismanagement, or maladministration on the part of a minister in the performance of his ministerial duties do not come within the purview of parliamentary privilege. And neither does an allegation that a minister permitted a budget leak constitute a matter of privilege."

That is in that book. If I could quote from

another writer, Michael Valpy said in a recent column in the *Globe and Mail*:

"A string of Speakers, stretching back more than two decades, has ruled that budget leaks do not constitute a breach of an MP's privilege. Breach of privilege means that an MP has been prevented from speaking freely, been molested or threatened or bribed, or something of that nature."

Mr. T. P. Reid: Do you believe everything that's in the *Globe* now? Read this morning's edition.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I believe everything—

Mr. Speaker: Never mind the interjections please.

Hon. Mr. Wells: After reading this morning's *Globe* and listening to what has been said, I think the person whose privileges have been molested and mistreated is the Treasurer.

Let me also remind my friend of something. I am sure the House leader for the Liberal Party, who is an astute student of parliamentary rules and precedent, will realize when he looks at some of the precedents about budget secrecy in the United Kingdom my friend talked about that, as Eugene Forsey said in a letter recently published in one of the papers, "All those precedents in Britain involved leaks of tax changes." Just remember that.

I submit that the question we are dealing with at this point is whether this is a legitimate point of privilege. There is a string of precedents from Speakers for decades that will show, as the law clerk of the House of Commons has shown in his book, that the matter we are on now does not constitute a point of privilege. Let me read two paragraphs from the last Speaker who has made a decision on this.

This is from Madam Speaker Jeanne Sauvé on November 18, 1981. This was in the case involving the publication by Canada Mortgage and Housing Corp. when there was a debate somewhat similar to this and questions of points of privilege and so forth. I will not read her whole statement, but there are these two paragraphs.

"What this particular precedent says to us is not that breaching budgetary secrecy is a question of privilege but that the honourable member for Kenora-Rainy River"—and I am sure my friend knows who that member is—"had a question of privilege because he had been accused by a newspaper of breaching budgetary secrecy and doing something dishonourable in the exercise of his function. That is the impor-

tant point which has to be considered in this case.

"I must repeat that the protection of privilege has to do with the protection of the capacity of honourable members to function as members in this House. If we are dealing with the wrongdoings, conduct or behaviour of a minister or the methods used by a minister of which some honourable members do not approve, that does not constitute a question of privilege, although it might be of great importance to the honourable members concerned. It is difficult for me to deal with such matters as questions of privilege."

Mr. Speaker, I can say no more than that while we are prepared to debate this matter for the full time this morning in an emergency debate, which we are agreeable to, this certainly does not constitute a point of privilege. No members' privileges have been abused by the events that have occurred in the last little while.

Mr. Speaker: The matter that has been raised by the Leader of the Opposition and joined in by the member for York South is indeed a very serious matter with wide ramifications. In the brief time that has been given to me to hear the arguments put forward, I am not going to try to make a judgement on this matter immediately. I will take it under consideration and make a decision and a judgement as quickly as possible.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your comment that you are going to take time and take the matter under advisement. I hope you will not mind if I, and perhaps certain other members, have an opportunity to express our views on the point to you.

Mr. Speaker: If I may, with all respect, I think the three parties have put their positions forward very eloquently. Rather than getting into a wide-ranging debate at this point, I must say there has been enough representation for me to make a judgement. I say to all honourable members that we should now get on with the regular business of the House.

Mr. Nixon: I regret, Mr. Speaker, that I cannot accept your advice in that regard. You may recall that at the first opportunity we had to put this before you last night you were unwilling to accept my advice on that occasion, and I may have an opportunity to raise that with you again.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Nixon: I want to say now, without expressing my view to you as an elected representative—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Nixon: I personally find it unacceptable, and you will certainly have to dispense with my services in this House if you are not prepared to hear my views on this matter, which I consider of urgent importance.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I respect the feelings of the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk. I certainly respect what he may have to say, whatever that may be. But when points of order or points of privilege have been raised, I think I have been very generous in listening to others besides the member who originally raised—

Mr. Nixon: Were you generous last night?

Mr. Wrye: What happened last night?

Mr. Speaker: Order. I am not going to get into a debate. There is nothing provided for in the standing orders—

Mr. O'Neil: The government House leader (Mr. Wells) talks about being fair, but you cut us off last night. You would not listen.

Mr. Speaker: I am not going to enter into a debate, but I would suggest to all honourable members once more to make themselves familiar with the standing orders.

10:30 a.m.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, there is no standing order that says only three views, one from each party, are to be heard by Mr. Speaker. I know of no such standing order and if you are introducing such a standing order then I must strongly object. I am not prepared to let this occasion pass without giving you the benefit of my views on this important matter. I beseech you to take your place in the chair and allow other elected members to express their views on this point of privilege. Nothing less is acceptable.

Mr. Speaker: Obviously, I have—

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about the decision which you are about to make and rise in support of the point of the individual members' rights to speak on the matter.

Mr. Speaker: I certainly respect that point of view. It was not my intention to limit anybody, but rather to facilitate the business of the House after having heard—

Mr. Breithaupt: This is the business of the House.

Mr. T. P. Reid: There is nothing more important.

Mr. Speaker: Order—after having heard the representatives of the three parties; however, if it is the wish of the members of this assembly

that I hear further representation, I will be pleased to do so.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to speak on this. Obviously what my friends want is a chance to discuss this matter. The speeches the members opposite gave had nothing to do with a privilege matter. My speech dealt with the privileges.

To facilitate all members who wish to discuss this, with the agreement of the two other parties, we would be agreeable to suspending all other business and moving into the emergency debate right now.

Mr. Nixon: I would like to point out to the government House leader that if we suspend the business for a debate on a matter of urgent public importance, the minister knows full well that nothing is concluded. The clock runs out at 1 p.m. As soon as the debate starts his own colleagues disappear and do whatever they do. We look at all the blue seats.

In this circumstance, Mr. Speaker, this is a day when you are going to earn your money. You have had quoted to you the thinking of Mr. Valpy, Mme Sauvé and the Speaker in the House of Commons in 1680 on this. I want to submit to you, if you will give me an opportunity in a few moments, that obviously the Premier and the Treasurer are considering this matter lightly. They are counting on their 68 supporters simply to inundate the opposition and to support what may very well be the eventual ruling that our privileges have not been interfered with.

I would submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that if you were to judge that our privileges have been abrogated, the Treasurer is done. Obviously he is not prepared to make this decision on his own, as was clearly the example established by at least one of his predecessors.

He is prepared to sit there and smile with the Premier, with 68 members beating their desks thinking that is justice. It is up to you, Mr. Speaker, to realize that the documents in the Globe and Mail which we have read have already had an impact on the citizens of this province. Think of what the farmers of Brant-Oxford-Norfolk think when they see the expenditure for agriculture is to be reduced by 13 per cent. It is already less than 1.5 per cent of the budget. Can you think of what the bankers are going to say to the farmers who go in there to get an extension of their loan?

We stand in the place of the nine million taxpayers in this province. The traditions, the procedures in this province since we entered

into Confederation and before, have been established on the secrecy of the budget. The Treasurer had his opportunity to use another procedure if he chose. He could certainly have opened it up, as he has said, and that may be the view of himself or his successors in the future. But he did not do that. He maintained it as secret, went through all of the jokes about Scary Tales comics and so on, but now we find, for example, that the money to be available for industry is to be reduced by 38 per cent, according to the papers in the Globe and Mail headed by Budget Statement by the Hon. Frank Miller, Budget 1983.

I would say to you, Mr. Speaker, if you consider that does not interfere with the business community, the farm community and our responsibility to represent them, then you are making a grave error indeed. If you do not make such a judgement in this connection, it means that the Treasurer, affable man that he is, with the support of the resurrected Premier of Ontario sitting back with his usual complacency when he is under any pressure at all, will simply laugh this out with the support of his 68 members.

It is up to you, Mr. Speaker, as the custodian of our privileges, to rule that they have been interfered with. When you do, there must be a resignation of the Treasurer, the establishment of a new budget, under new budgetary leadership, and nothing less is acceptable under the circumstances of our privileges being so seriously breached.

I simply end by saying, Mr. Speaker, that you must understand that we stand in the place of the nine million citizens of Ontario, residents of Ontario for whom we speak and who elected us, and that the breaches of information have affected business already. The farmers in my constituency, the business people in my constituency, had the right to receive this information all at the same time and not have it leaked out by press investigation.

There really is only one choice for you, Mr. Speaker, and that is to rule not that he should resign or that somebody was stealing something, or that a committee should look through garbage bags, but that our privileges have been breached.

Mr. McClellan: Mr. Speaker, I want to deal with the comments made by the government House leader that this matter is somehow not particularly serious and does not constitute a breach of privilege because we are not dealing with a tax measure.

That is preposterous. The main leak, the

main item that has been spilled from the budget, has to do with the five per cent Ontario health insurance plan premium increase. The government of Ontario raises hundreds of millions of dollars through the taxation of people through premiums. It is preposterous to argue that somehow this is a mere peccadillo, this is not serious, this is somehow insignificant—a five per cent increase in one of the major government user taxes, indirect taxes, sales taxes.

As if that were not enough, the Treasurer was heard on the radio this morning at least to suggest that he was prepared to pull a Lalonde and extricate himself from the mess that the government is in by somehow adjusting the budget between now and Tuesday night. The clear inference, and I may say the clear threat, is that there is a possibility of a further increase to the OHIP premium.

If the budget process of Ontario now gets to be created, adjusted, influenced, affected as a result of this process, we are in a complete and preposterous mess. The Treasurer has compromised the budget-setting process of Ontario in the most profound and complete way possible.

10:40 a.m.

If he does not change the budget between now and Tuesday night, if he is unwilling to do it in front of the Legislature, he verifies that the leaks are indeed bona fide budget documents. If the budget figures are changed between now and Tuesday night, it is clear that the budget process itself has been affected by this.

Mr. Gordon: What a childish argument.

Mr. McClellan: I do not know what is childish about a major alteration in a major tax of the government of Ontario as a result of the negligence of the minister of the Treasury. It is a very simple proposition, and I fail to see how the government can think it will simply get away with this by stonewalling and steamrolling.

Mr. Conway: Mr. Speaker, I will be brief. I want to join in this debate—

Hon. Mr. Ashe: It doesn't look brief from here.

Mr. Conway: Mr. Speaker, if I may have your attention and that of honourable members, it is a serious matter. I appreciate the interventions that have been made by others. I simply want to make a few comments in specific terms.

First, it concerns me greatly that the indications are that the Treasurer knew as of about late yesterday afternoon or early last evening that this material was going to be in the public

press at or around 10 p.m. last night, and I do feel that the privileges of honourable members have been abridged to this extent at least: that the Treasurer had a duty and an obligation to the 124 other members with whom he shares this place to come here at the earliest opportunity, to express himself on these matters and to indicate the circumstances in which this apparent leak or spill had taken place. That he did not do so is a serious breach of the privileges of the members of this House.

In fact, as the member for York South has pointed out, there may be a variety or a whole host of circumstances surrounding this material of which we are not yet apprised. The Treasurer had a duty, it seems to me, to come to this place as soon as he knew there was going to be this kind of press report to take members of this House into his confidence. In that respect he did not do the parliamentary thing, and I believe the privileges of this House, to that degree at least, were abridged.

The government House leader referred to Parliamentary Privilege in Canada, by Joseph Maingot. I do not want to repeat that, but I do want to indicate, as has been mentioned by a number of other members, that there is a variety of issues at stake. The fundamental one for me, of course, is the whole concept of ministerial responsibility, something the Premier (Mr. Davis) and I were talking about in this place some few hours ago. The principle of ministerial responsibility is absolutely central to this debate. The minister, as has been pointed out, has responsibility for this budget from its conception to its delivery on budget day.

Sir Geoffrey Howe, the current British Chancellor of the Exchequer, recently allowed, and I will quote one sentence from his comments on the subject of budget secrecy: "The budget is shrouded in secrecy until the chancellor unveils his master plan. He presents it as a fiscal fait accompli, receptive to neither the benefit nor the opportunity of prior examination or constructive comment."

I think in a real way this remark says it all. The principle of ministerial responsibility, as R. MacGregor Dawson points out in his much-referred-to book, *The Government of Canada*, is central to the basic principle of our parliamentary democracy. In my humble submission this principle of ministerial responsibility, and therefore the very essence of our parliamentary democracy, has been undermined in this connection.

Like other members—and I think of my friend the member for Bellwoods (Mr. McClellan)—I have complained to you, Mr. Speaker, on at least two occasions in recent months about the leaks around here. I can think of some involving the Minister of Health (Mr. Grossman), about which a number of complaints have been registered. Some of us, quite frankly, have harboured suspicions about how some of this material is getting into the public press.

I think of how many honourable members across the way chortled not too many days ago when the Minister of Health, in what I thought was a subterranean tactic to say the least, engaged the House in some debate about what the member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Kerrio) had been discussing in matters related to health policy. Talk about a breach of parliamentary honour. It seems to me we have been seeing too much of it around this place. We all know that the leaks have been a matter of ongoing concern.

In this case, I will conclude by saying that the Treasurer had an obligation to come to this House at the earliest opportunity, which was last evening some time between eight and 10:30 p.m.—in fact, the House sat until about 11:30 p.m.—to announce to this place what had happened and what his intentions were.

I heard a minister of the crown talking on a Toronto radio station about a police investigation and related matters. Those are very important issues, as I know the Solicitor General (Mr. G. W. Taylor) would agree. The Treasurer had an obligation, as an honourable member and as a minister of the crown, to come to this place and to announce his intentions and give some kind of initial explanation.

That he did not do so abrogated our parliamentary privileges. By allowing this alleged budget spill to carry across the pages of the daily press and much of the electronic media in this province has undermined the basic principle of ministerial responsibility.

I think the Treasurer has, as my colleague the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk has indicated, a first-order obligation in the tradition of the great Darcy McKeough to resign, at least to stand down until the air is cleared, and then of course to reconsider his position.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I simply want to draw to your attention two or three matters which perhaps you will take into consideration when considering this particular serious matter. I am referring at this time to the events other than the fact that the Treasurer did not see fit to

make his first statement about this matter in the assembly, which I will comment on briefly in a moment or so.

When you are giving consideration to this question and, indeed, when the government is considering what it will do with respect to the future problems that need to be resolved because of what has transpired in connection with the appointment of a committee of this assembly to look into a number of matters, I would like to draw your attention to the matter which affected the brother of our colleague the member for Rainy River (Mr. T. P. Reid) when the sixth report of the standing committee on privileges and elections of the House of Commons in 1975 had to say, and I quote from that report—not all of the report, of course:

“Your committee reasserts the principle that the reputation of every member of the House of Commons must continue to be protected, because a reflection upon a member is a reflection upon the House itself. At the same time, your committee is conscious of the balance which must be struck between the principle that Parliament should be protected from improper obstruction of its functions and the principle of freedom of speech of the citizen to criticize the institution or membership of Parliament.”

Then I refer to the statement made by the then Minister of Finance, the Honourable Donald S. Macdonald, in the House of Commons on May 25, 1976, when he stated:

“The tradition of budget secrecy has two grounds. It is intended to deny anyone financial advantage from advance information. And it is intended to ensure that important statements of government economic policy are disclosed first to members of the House of Commons. Both of these reasons are valid and important.”

10:50 a.m.

I would refer to the study done by the parliamentary group on budgetary process in 1977, in which it states the rule would appear to rest on two premises. The first premise is that no one should be able to gain a private advantage by reason of advance information about matters to be dealt with in a budget. The second is that all important statements of government policy ought to be announced first at the House of Commons.

It then goes on to make this comment—I draw this particularly not only to the Speaker's attention but to the government's as it determines what will be done: “In practice, however, there has been very little in the way of critical

analysis of the scope of the rule and the context of the role of the budget in modern times. Little has been written about the subject."

Mr. Speaker, I would say to you that the first question which you must decide is whether or not this is a matter of privilege. The consequences of your decision will then determine in large measure what the House must do, what the assembly must do and, indeed, what the government must do. In a funny way, the point of privilege is crucial to the ongoing determination of what course we may follow.

It is clear to me in any event, and I make this submission to the Speaker, that if it is determined that there has been financial advantage to anyone—whatever that term "financial advantage" may mean—I do not think the Treasurer has any alternative under the rigid, arbitrary and harsh rule.

If, however, it is not a matter in which it can be honestly determined there has been a financial advantage, then we come to a different question and that is the extent and degree of the negligence and the carelessness or the lack of proper precautions to protect the assembly, to protect the secrecy of the budget, and whether there was an omission on the minister's part.

I want to make it clear that there is absolutely nothing which would indicate that the minister himself has made any disclosure or that the minister himself has committed any indiscretion, which are part of the historic reasons why on other occasions either members of the cabinet or chancellors have been forced to resign.

Again I want to say to the Speaker, if he makes no decision at all on this issue until he has reflected on it, I wish he would make on behalf of this House the most formal statement he can to stop persons involved outside, who may be witnesses before a committee of this assembly, from making any statements to anyone.

This is why I felt very deeply and badly about the fact that the first comment I heard from the Treasurer was heard over the radio and in the media. I think that in itself is a serious matter.

It has just come to my attention that there is circulated from the Office of the Premier to members of the press gallery a statement saying:

"I have been informed that the chairman of the board of Carswell Co. Ltd. and Carswell Printing has an important statement to communicate to the members of the press regarding the incident reported in the *Globe and Mail* of this morning. Mr. Mullin, QC, can be reached by

phone at his office at First Canadian Place, 39th floor, in the law offices of Fraser and Beatty."

I want someone to get on the phone to Mr. John A. Mullin of the law firm of Fraser and Beatty and, with the greatest respect as a classmate of his, I would tell him to tell the president of that company to keep his mouth shut until the matter is reviewed in this assembly.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Speaker, when we are talking about privileges in this House, there may be those in the public or, on occasion, in the press gallery who worry about how we view our opinions of what is going on in this province. But when one sees this news release brought before us over the name of Denis Massicotte it makes one wonder how seriously the government, its staff and supporters take this Legislature. It is very difficult, indeed it is upsetting and it is rude that we should see something like this as another side-door approach to the privileges of this House.

I have no quarrel with Mr. Mullin speaking to whomsoever he may wish. It may well be a convenience for the Premier's office, his staff and others to ensure that as many people are talking about this matter as is possible. It looks to me that instead of coming into this Legislature, perhaps with a statement on behalf of the people who are the printers, then I think—

Hon. Mr. Davis: It's right here. Give him a chance to make it.

Mr. Breithaupt: We will be delighted to hear from him in due course. It is things like this I find very upsetting.

Hon. Mr. Davis: He has been waiting since 10 o'clock.

Mr. Breithaupt: I am delighted to have the Premier's interjection that the Treasurer is prepared to speak to this House and we will give him the opportunity to do so right now.

Mr. Rae: Go ahead.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Come on.

Mr. Wrye: Come on.

Mr. McClellan: Make the statement.

Hon. Mr. Davis: He will be making a ministerial statement.

Mr. Foulds: Why doesn't he make his statement?

Mr. Mancini: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege: If the Treasurer is not going to speak, I would like to make a point of privilege. If the Treasurer wishes to speak, I will certainly give the Treasurer the floor.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I would suggest we move to ministerial statements and then we can resume this debate afterwards on consent of the House.

Mr. Mancini: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege: One could almost have felt sorry for the Treasurer until the statement from Mr. Massicotte was brought to our attention.

Unlike the leader of the third party, I do not believe we should first put the Treasurer in jail and then find out if he is guilty or not. That is not the main point in the points of privilege that have been raised today. The main point that has been raised is whether or not the Treasurer inadvertently or purposely abused the privileges of the members of this House. We will find out later under what circumstances the situation took place.

When the Treasurer of Ontario has his credibility smeared, it not only affects him but it affects the whole province. It affects all the business structure of Ontario. Indeed it affects the people on Wall Street who are going to borrow money for the Treasurer on behalf of the people of Ontario.

The \$733 million which, as was stated in the *Globe and Mail*, was to be borrowed for our short cash flow is going to have a serious impact on the people of this province. Unless the Treasurer can give an adequate explanation as to how these matters appeared to take place, all of us are on the losing end of this situation.

Yesterday evening I was truly shocked to see the front page of the *Globe and Mail*. Never could I have imagined that a leak of this proportion could have taken place under the secrecy that is to be encircled around Treasury documents. When we were able to read about the shocking cuts that were to take place, I truly believe that not only affected the members but all the communities of this province.

Also, yesterday evening we awaited some word from the Treasurer. We were truly disappointed that he saw fit to meet with the press and not to meet with the members of this Legislature. That is a second breach of privilege the Treasurer has brought upon the members of this House.

11 a.m.

Mr. Speaker, you will recall that last Tuesday certain questions were put to the Premier. He told us to wait until the budget date. He said he could not give us any further information at that time. If the matters were secret on Tuesday, then they should be secret today, they should be

secret tomorrow and they should be secret until the time allotted for the Treasurer to make his statement next Tuesday.

I do not want to go on to repeat what other members have said, but I have to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that if what took place yesterday is not a breach of the privileges of the members of this House, then there is very little that can take place in this chamber that can breach anybody's privileges.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Kitchener-Wilmot (Mr. Sweeney).

Mr. Gordon: Here comes the bishop.

Mr. Bradley: The Premier will not like that comment.

Mr. Sweeney: Mr. Speaker, you have just been advised by some of my colleagues of our great displeasure at the way in which the matter of Carswell Printing Co. has been handled. I would like to read into the record the statement from Carswell Printing Co. The statement is by Mr. John Mullin, chairman of the board of Carswell Printing Co.

"Carswell Printing Co. has maintained the best possible methods of ensuring secrecy in relation to the printing of the provincial budget, which it has done for many years. These security measures are under the supervision of the Ontario Provincial Police and have been approved by them. They include the shredding of all scrap. It appears, however, that a few proofs of pages were placed in garbage which was not shredded but which remained on the printing plant property. These scraps were searched for and removed by a reporter or reporters who quite improperly trespassed and invaded the plant property and searched the garbage, which was still the property of the printing company. Consideration is being given to instituting procedures for theft."

Mr. Speaker, we should fully understand that these security measures are part of the jurisdiction of the Treasurer. As a matter of fact, on Wednesday of this week, when the Treasurer playfully held a photo session with reporters, it was reported that he took painstaking measures to ensure that he did not leak the budget.

It is also known that up until two years ago the security staff of this building was responsible for the security of the budget. At that time the Treasurer decided to make a change, and make the Ontario Provincial Police responsible for it. What I am trying to point out is that the Treasurer clearly understands himself, and has taken measures to ensure, that he is ultimately

accountable and responsible for the secrecy of this budget.

The second point is that the Treasurer has clearly indicated by his actions and by his words that the secrecy of the budget is manifestly important to him. As my colleagues have already indicated, he could have chosen not to adopt a secrecy procedure. He did so choose and, therefore, he is responsible for it.

The House leader of the government party has indicated to us that our individual privileges have not been misused. We have to realize that each one of us in this opposition party is responsible, as a member of Her Majesty's loyal opposition, for being a critic of the various ministries of this government. Yet we are advised through this leak—it is not a leak; it is a deluge—that 37 per cent of the budgetary allotment for the Ministry of Industry and Trade is going to be reduced. I suggest, as critic for that ministry, that this does impinge upon my responsibilities as critic and my responsibilities as a member of this Legislature.

That says to the people I am trying to represent in this House that there is going to be reduced growth and development in the area of industry and trade, at the very time when we need increased growth and development. It says there is going to be a reduction in research and development, at the very time we need an increase in research and development. It says there is going to be a reduction in employment opportunities, at the very time we need an increase in employment opportunities. It says there is going to be a reduction in productivity gains, at the very time we need increases in productivity gains.

That is the message that is clearly being sent out to the businessmen, the manufacturers and industry in Ontario. That may not be the intention—I see the Premier shaking his head—that may not be the intention, but between today and next Tuesday that is one of the messages that can clearly go out, and that is an abrogation of my privileges as a member of this House.

It is also clearly indicated, with respect to any possible gain by people outside this House, there are three or four issues that have been brought to our attention through this leak. We see, for example, that corporation tax revenue is supposed to go up by 29 per cent. We know from every single indicator that has been given to us from other sources that the economy of this province is certainly not going to grow by 29 per cent. Some of that 29 per cent would be

accounted for by growth. Part of it must be accounted for in some other taxation measure. We do not know what they are, but there is bound to be rampant speculation on Bay Street today and on Monday and Tuesday as to how the government accounts for that 29 per cent, and it is going to affect the markets in this province.

We also know that the Treasurer has boasted over the years that he did not have to go out and borrow money on the public market. He has said they did not do that and they did not want to do it. Yet this report indicates that up to \$733 million is going to be borrowed on the public market. Does that not send a signal out there? Does that not indicate something to investors and borrowers and lenders? It most certainly does. It is a significant leak.

We see in this report that the transfer of money from the federal government to the provincial government is going to increase from \$1.9 billion to \$2.3 billion. At the same time, we see that provincial transfers to municipalities, agencies and boards are going to increase from \$5.4 billion to \$5.7 billion. Does that not send a message to the business community? Does that not send a message to those who deal with provincial-municipal relations? Darned right it does.

All those people now have information they are going to act on in one way or another. We do not know how they are going to act on it, but the information now is in the public domain and can make a difference to how people make decisions over the next two or three days. That is a leak of substance. That is a leak of importance.

Mr. Speaker, my privileges as an individual member of this House have been invaded and abrogated. My privileges as a critic in Her Majesty's loyal opposition have been abrogated and, therefore, with legitimate right, I stand before you and say that you must so decide.

Mr. McClellan: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: We are prepared to listen to the Treasurer if he would do us the courtesy of making a statement.

Mr. Breagh: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: I want to make a couple of comments. One of the things that I am beginning to find rather aggravating is that the House has now been in session for a rather lengthy period of time. I had anticipated, quite frankly, that the Treasurer would have made a statement to the Legislature this morning.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Let us recognize the rights of the members. The member for Oshawa rose on a point of order.

11:10 a.m.

Mr. Breauch: If I might just continue briefly, I have been sitting here in the Legislature this morning waiting for the Treasurer to account for what happened—what was reported last night and this morning on the radio. There have been probably a dozen opportunities for the Treasurer to take the floor in the course of this debate or before it, or, on a number of occasions now, for the government to ask other members to give way so the Treasurer might make that statement.

Paramount to all the arguments about privilege, secrecy and all that is the simple rule I would recognize as being the first one: the Treasurer has an obligation to explain to us, the members of this Legislature, just what the hell happened.

I do not see much indication that this is going to occur, and on the point of privilege that members are purportedly debating this morning I would think the Speaker would want an explanation from the Treasurer as to what did occur.

So I am going to use a not-often-used part of our standing orders. I am going to give way so that the Treasurer may now rise in his place and explain to us just what did occur.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, there has been great comment about the proper procedure today. I have a statement. I assume that ministerial statements are made under orders of the day. I am prepared to make my statement under orders of the day when the matter of personal privilege has been resolved. I will do it at that time.

Mr. Rae: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: The point of privilege that has been raised by members on this side is a question that can be answered only in the course of the privilege debate by the Treasurer himself. It is a matter the Treasurer has to respond to, and for him to hide behind a ministerial statement and refuse to deal with this in the course of this discussion with respect to the privilege, in itself demonstrates a contempt for the proceedings of this House.

Mr. Speaker: I think we are getting a little ahead of ourselves. The point of privilege was raised, and he was—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order. It is my decision to make, to find out whether a point of privilege has been made or breached.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Will the honourable member please resume his seat?

Mr. Riddell: Mr. Speaker, I have two or three points I want to make to the point of privilege.

First of all, I am bothered by the contempt that the Conservatives show for this House and this issue. I have been watching them drift in and out, and there was a point when there were fewer than 40 members in the House on the Conservative side. This is a major issue, and those benches should be filled to capacity when we are discussing an issue of this kind.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Will the honourable member just confine his remarks to the point of privilege?

Mr. Riddell: As the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk indicated, we have been elected to this Legislature to react, to respond and to represent nine million citizens in this province. Not only that, but I think it is our duty to dispel any suspicions that the people outside these chambers may have about the parliamentary process and the way in which members are supposed to be guided by parliamentary tradition. I want to deal with that in the last of my comments.

I represent a certain group of people known as farmers, as many other members do in this Legislature, and they have been visiting my office in droves, asking what they may expect in the budget, because it will certainly have an effect on what their plans are going to be. In other words, they have been asking me whether we might expect some kind of financial assistance, either long-term credit or a reinforced Ontario farm adjustment assistance program. They have been making arrangements with their bankers whereby the banks would take a mortgage for a year, let us say, hoping something will be announced in the budget so they can then transfer that mortgage to a long-term financial credit.

Based on the information we received in the throne speech, and based on information I received from the Deputy Minister of Agriculture and Food, I have been telling the farmers there is some glimmer of hope that the farmers might well expect something from this government. Then we see from this budget leak that there has been a 13 per cent cut in the agriculture budget.

When the comments have been made, the Premier has been saying, "It has been printed in the estimates year after year after year." What a preposterous statement that is. When we did the Ministry of Agriculture and Food estimates last time, there was no mention of a 13 per cent reduction in the agriculture budget. With the agriculture budget now being 1.1 per cent of the total provincial budget, where can one cut any more if the farm industry is to be saved? That is what they are worried about and that is what I am worrying about.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: You are doing the farmers a disservice with your games.

Mr. Riddell: What is going to happen is that when the farmers now go into lending institutions to get loans, the lending institutions are going to say—

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: You are a disgrace.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Will the honourable member resume his seat, please? Let us listen to the member for Huron-Middlesex.

Mr. Riddell: There is great confusion in the farming industry as a result of the leak in this budget, because at this time, when the farmers are going in to arrange operating loans to plant their crops, the lending institutions now are going to say based on this budget: "The government obviously is not committed to your cause because of the 13 per cent reduction. Why should we be committed?" The farmers are going to be in more trouble as a result of that leak. With that in mind and with what I have been telling the farmers, I figure my privileges have been breached.

Last, I mention about dispelling suspicions. I have been receiving calls since last night from people who are a little suspicious of what has gone on. We all know that it would take at least a day, so I am told, to prepare the wide spread that was in the Globe and Mail to have it come out in the Globe and Mail last night.

Questions are being asked of me. I hope the person to whom I am going to direct this will get up and dispel any suspicions. What they are saying is, "Is there any connection between the budget leak of yesterday and the decision of the Premier only hours before that he was not going to contest the leadership?"

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Will the honourable member resume his seat, please?

Mr. Riddell: Will the Premier get up in his place and tell us he did not know the budget was in foreign hands before he made that decision. Will he do that?

Mr. Speaker: Order. The honourable member will resume his seat.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I do not think I heard the honourable member. So we can all hear it, would he please state what he said in the last part of his question? I do not think I heard it. I hope I did not hear it. I cannot think of one of his colleagues who would tolerate what I think I heard.

11:20 a.m.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The member was departing from the point of privilege. I am of the opinion that the presentations are becoming somewhat repetitive. I think we have had a fair representation of opinion and submissions. I wonder if I could get a consensus or a feeling—

Mr. Nixon: Not without hearing from the Treasurer.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege. I want to speak to the other matter of privilege in a moment to try to help to sort it out a little bit.

On a matter of personal privilege, I believe the member for Huron-Middlesex (Mr. Riddell) either asked a question or phrased a statement coming from his own fertile imagination that may show on Hansard—and I will look for it. In fairness to every single member in the House, including members of his own party, if I heard him correctly and I hope I did not, this is an opportunity for him either to restate it, not saying he has been asked this by others but recognizing it is a statement made by him, or withdraw it.

Mr. Riddell: Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me say it was suspicions that were raised with me. But if the Premier wants to take the debate and move it to the part I mentioned, then I will withdraw the latter part of my remarks.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It was a cheap shot.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, on the point of privilege: We certainly see it as being in your hands to direct that the Treasurer respond to the points that have been raised, to bring this discussion of the point of privilege to an end.

If I can come back to the main point of why we are here, it is because there has been an unprecedented budget leak. The Treasurer failed to stand up at the opening of the session this morning to explain what had happened, and he

should now make that explanation as part of the point of privilege. I therefore give way to the Treasurer so he may speak.

Mr. Speaker: I will hear one more speaker and then we will get on to the routine proceedings.

Mr. Van Horne: Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that I am the last in our party who was to speak anyway, and I will be brief.

An hon. member: No, you are not.

Mr. Van Horne: I am not? Sorry about that.

At any rate, the point made by the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk in the very beginning was that he simply wanted to have the right to do what he is elected to do, and that is to speak in this chamber. Mr. Speaker, you have granted him that right and I think it applies equally to all of us. If there are others, I am sure you will be so kind as to listen to them too.

My point is very simple and very brief. I point out that we are taking this matter of privilege very seriously because it affects the credibility of the whole parliamentary process and, in turn, the credibility of its members.

If we look back at the throne speech we find a couple of statements in there that I think are related to what I am saying now. We read first that the government will introduce measures to contribute to an enduring economic recovery that will create the jobs necessary to allow Ontarians to lead productive lives and that it will strengthen the management of the province's affairs. Certainly the budget is part of that.

It goes on to say that emphasis will be placed on strengthening the province's long-term economic potential. My colleagues have indicated the seriousness of this particular happening on the monetary matters of this province and the international money market, and certainly for people within the community who have to go to banks for loans. I am referring, of course, to members of the agricultural community.

Finally, if I can paraphrase what the Treasurer said this morning when I listened to him on one of the radio stations, he said essentially that the issue is not who goofed or how the information got out; the issue is whether in fact information did get out, and if it did, the Treasurer or the minister has to accept responsibility. He made a point of repeating that. I do not think there is any question that the information got out. What we want to hear is him accepting the responsibility for it getting out.

Mr. Speaker: I indicated when I recognized the member for London North (Mr. Van Horne) that he would be the last speaker to be heard. I

would like to think I could have the co-operation of the House to get ahead with the routine proceedings.

Mr. Nixon: You are certainly going to get lots of co-operation from the Premier and the Treasurer on that one.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Renfrew North, briefly.

Mr. Conway: Yes, Mr. Speaker, very briefly. It concerns me a great deal that this morning there have been two versions of a statement released by Mr. John Mullin, chairman of the board, Carswell Printing Co., referred to by the member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick).

The Liberal Party research individual picked up what I will call exhibit 1 at the offices of Fraser and Beatty. There is a second version, which I will call exhibit 2 and which was circulated in the Queen's Park press gallery. These are not the same scripts. It is the same language, clearly. The layout and the typing is different. I am suspicious about the difference.

The office of my friend the Premier was associated with exhibit 2. Perhaps he will speak to that. This is of great concern to those who have had this kind of experience. The Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Timbrell), who in an earlier incarnation was Minister of Health, will recall doctored documents. I want to submit exhibits 1 and 2 of the Mullin statement and ask you to consider them, and the Premier may wish to clear the air. We want to be sure the Carswell Printing Co. is speaking for itself in all respects and is not acting in some adjunct capacity for anyone else.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, to try to confine the issues somewhat, I will speak very briefly to the last point raised by the honourable member.

I have not seen exhibits 1 or 2—I have seen the notice given—because our office has been inundated by requests from the press and others with respect to this matter. I am quite prepared to accept either version of Mr. Mullin's statement. There is no authorship in the Premier's office or anywhere else; I do not think we should let that obscure our discussions. I am not familiar with either of the two statements. The member says there may be some difference—

Mr. T. P. Reid: You shouldn't be involved in his statement at all.

Hon. Mr. Davis: He asked that this be transmitted, I gather. I do not see any harm or any problem with that. I just do not want that to become part of the issue.

Mr. T. P. Reid: That is not the function of the Premier's office. Will you send out mine?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Listen, we are here, it is a Friday morning, and people communicate. With great respect, the members opposite do it on their stationery day after day. There is nothing improper in that.

Mr. Conway: Did you get your office to type one of these copies?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I do not have the foggiest idea.

Mr. Conway: Can the Premier find out?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Sure. But I do not think it is relevant, with respect.

Mr. Speaker: I think we should now proceed—

Mr. McGuigan: I would like to challenge your ruling, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: It is not a ruling. I am acting at the request of the House; I am in your hands. I just made the observation that I felt the representations were becoming repetitive.

The member for Kent-Elgin.

Mr. McGuigan: Mr. Speaker, I direct my remarks only to you. My privileges have been abused in this situation, because yesterday, today and all this weekend I have appointments to meet with farmers and businessmen.

One of the farmers has been presented a letter from his bank saying that under the Ontario farm adjustment assistance program the bank will go along with him this year provided he signs a statement saying he will voluntarily liquidate next year. This man has seed ready to go into the ground this very day. He is looking to me for advice as to whether he should chuck the whole thing, put an end to it now, or go ahead and plant those crops.

How can I, as a conscientious person, offer that man advice when we have a report that there is such and such a thing in the budget, that we are sending out a signal to bankers and financial people and all involved that we are downgrading the agricultural industry? Is that in the budget or is it not? At this moment I do not know, and I do not know how I can respond to those people.

Interjection.

Mr. McGuigan: The Treasurer has been invited many times.

I have people who are involved in the new employment expansion and development program. One man has put about eight years into a project; it is at the very crucial stage as to whether or not it goes forward. If it goes

forward, a great many people will be employed; if it does not go forward this man will lose his property, his goods, his house and his furniture, and he could very well be out on the road. What sort of advice can I give that man this weekend when I do not know what signals are being sent by this government?

11:30 a.m.

On Sunday I am going to a celebration in Dresden, to the opening of a museum that is celebrating 100 years since the death of Josiah Henson.

Mr. Gordon: You'll fit right in, you're just about that age.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Isn't the Premier ashamed of that remark by his colleague?

Mr. Speaker: Order. The member for Rainy River will please resume his seat.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Mr. Speaker, on a point of personal privilege.

Mr. Speaker: No, there is one on the floor and I am listening to it.

Mr. T. P. Reid: I will deal with it as soon as—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. McGuigan: Mr. Speaker, I make no apologies for my age. The Lord willing, I will be 60 years old this November.

Mr. Speaker: Now to the point of privilege, please.

Mr. McGuigan: Those 60 years have taught me a little bit about humility, about honour and about tradition, and that is what we are really talking about here in this whole debate.

I am going to be speaking on Sunday at this celebration of 100 years since the death of Josiah Henson. One of the things that comes to mind is that 150 to 200 years ago there were people who said slavery was a necessary evil: it was evil, but you had to have it. But there were other people who said there was a higher morality, that the British system meant more than the economic system. The people of morality prevailed and we did away with slavery.

Where is morality today in this situation? I would not feel so bad about the Treasurer had he come in here last night and laid it on the table. Had he resigned and had the Premier rejected the resignation, I would not feel so bad about it. But we were cut off in this Legislature. We have a flood of press releases. We have all of these uncertainties that abridge my privileges as a back-bench member who on this weekend has a lot of people to deal with.

I am very sad and I am very sorry about the

events that have happened. I just feel that those traditions and those high principles are being voided, and I am sorry for that.

Mr. Foulds: Mr. Speaker, under standing order 19(b) I move that the Treasurer do now speak.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The member for Rainy River rose first.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I would not ordinarily do this, but I sat here yesterday afternoon and was lectured by the Premier himself in self-righteous tones that I have not even heard outdone by the New Democratic Party about name-calling and personal references.

In the last half hour in this House we have heard, from the Conservative back benches, one of my colleagues referred to as "the bishop," and I believe it was the member for Sudbury (Mr. Gordon) referring to my friend in derogatory terms with regard to his age.

Now I would presume, Mr. Speaker—

Interjections.

Mr. T. P. Reid: I'm not being self-righteous.

Mr. Speaker: Never mind the interjections, please.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Perhaps we do not have a standard here, as I had presumed. The Premier was addressing himself to it yesterday, and lectured us ad nauseam, so I presume that he will do the honourable thing, stand in his place and repudiate those two remarks on behalf of the Conservative caucus.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sudbury, please. Order.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, on the matter of personal privilege—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: I will recognize the Premier because he is going to respond directly. The member for Sudbury shakes his head.

Mr. Gordon: Mr. Speaker, in the heat of the debate I have to say that my remark was unparliamentary and I certainly withdraw it and apologize to the member.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, on the matter of personal privilege raised by the member for Rainy River—

Interjection.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Okay, the point of order. I would like to reply to the point of order.

The member for Sudbury has already indicated that he withdraws his remark. I would only say to the member for Kitchener-Wilmot

(Mr. Sweeney), and I do not say this facetiously, I was at the traditional Easter gathering of the Catholic bishops of Ontario and the trustees' association some many years ago and I was introduced as Bishop Davis. There was great applause and I was very flattered. I have never considered that as being a derogatory term, and I am sure his colleague will not.

If the member is going to get up and ask me to discipline or say something to members of my caucus, I am prepared to do that—

Mr. T. P. Reid: You lectured us all afternoon yesterday.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Now listen, that's fine.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Sure, you can be as pious as you want. Maybe you should be a bishop. I've never seen one as pious as you are.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Foulds: Mr. Speaker, if you had not heard me previously, I move under standing order 19(b) that—

Mr. Speaker: I have indeed heard you, and I was going to deal with that.

Mr. Foulds: —the Treasurer, the member for Muskoka, do now speak.

Mr. Speaker: I must point out that that covers the rules of debate and we are not really having a debate. We are dealing with a point of privilege that was raised by the Leader of the Opposition. We have been confining our remarks to that point of privilege, so really it does not fall within the parameters of the standing orders to accept that motion.

Mr. Nixon: On that point, Mr. Speaker, if I may: There is a motion before the House; you are about to rule it out of order, perhaps, but I would like to speak on it just before you do.

Mr. Speaker: Which motion?

Mr. Nixon: The motion that the Treasurer be now heard. You have not ruled it out of order, but you are getting fairly close to it.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk.

Mr. Nixon: I must say I agree to some extent with what the honourable member put forward. It is incredible that the Treasurer has not risen in his place to defend himself in this important point of privilege. He has said he is prepared to speak in ministerial statements, which come up later.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps you are supposed to draw the information you require for your important decision from something that is said

after this debate. The Treasurer probably presumes that because he is a minister he has some special privilege in this connection; but it seems to me that he is badly advised by his seatmates to the left and right when he does not rise in his place as an honourable member and explain this situation.

It may very well be satisfactory to his colleagues and to the Speaker, but how can the Speaker make a legitimate decision without hearing the Treasurer's defence?

I have every sympathy with the purpose of the motion before us. You can lead a horse to water, but you cannot make it drink. The House can vote to hear the Treasurer, but if he will not speak there is nothing we can do but urge him to do the proper thing, and that is speak on this point of privilege.

Mr. Rotenberg: Mr. Speaker, on the point raised by the member for Port Arthur (Mr. Foulds), it says, "A motion may be made by any member who has risen." I would submit the Treasurer has not risen and therefore the motion is out of order.

11:40 a.m.

Mr. Speaker: If I may deal with the motion that was made by the member for Port Arthur—

Mr. Foulds: Mr. Speaker, may I speak to it?

Mr. Speaker: But you already have.

Mr. Foulds: No, I haven't. I just made the motion. You never allowed me to speak to my own motion.

Mr. Speaker: I thought you were on your feet twice.

Mr. Foulds: I just want to say I find it absolutely incredible that we have this very important matter before us. The Treasurer has indicated by various means, as has the Premier, that he has a statement to make, and that statement has to do with the most important matter that is before this Legislature in this province, and it has not been made. Whether the procedure is through a point of privilege, through a ministerial statement, or through rule 19(b), I plead with the Treasurer and I plead with the House, to allow the Treasurer to speak.

Mr. Speaker: This is a matter of procedure, and to deal with the motion which was made by the member for Port Arthur I would have to rule, as I think he well knows, that the motion is indeed out of order. That, first of all, covers rules of debate, and second is only applied when two or more members rise to speak at the same

time. I rule the motion, however well intentioned, out of order.

We are dealing with a point of privilege which you have asked me to take into consideration. I will do that and will give it my most serious consideration. I would like to thank all those honorable members who have taken the time to make me aware of their views, and now if we can get on with routine proceedings we will have statements from the ministry.

STATEMENT BY THE MINISTRY

BUDGETARY PROCESS

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I wish to give a report to this House—

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, I just want to observe to the Treasurer that I do not have a copy of the statement, which is the normal courtesy.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I wish to give a report to this House on the incidents which have occurred in the last 24 hours with respect to certain aspects of the production of the 1983 Ontario budget. I will begin by sharing with the members the sequence of events that took place yesterday afternoon.

First, members of my Treasury staff were alerted Thursday afternoon to apparent attempts to breach security at the premises of Carswell Printing Co., where I had planned to have the budget printed. As a result of this, a request was made to the Ontario Provincial Police, who are responsible for part of the security of the budget, to investigate this matter.

Yesterday, I met in my office with Robert Stephens and Rosemary Speirs, two reporters from the Globe and Mail. This meeting took place at their request. At that time, they showed me documents purported to be parts of my budget. I have not received from the Globe and Mail copies of these documents.

As the members of this House know, I cannot comment on any of the specifics of my budget. If I were to do so, I would be breaching budget secrecy. However, I can say that the documents that were shown to me yesterday did not appear to be from final drafts of my budget, nor could they have been since final decisions have not yet been made.

Interjections.

Hon. F. S. Miller: That happens to be true.

The actual drafting of a budget begins long before the final decisions are made. As every member of this House knows, the preparation of a budget is a very complex process and involves the compilation and analysis of complicated

financial information. To expedite production, I send preliminary material to the printers very early in the process, in fact well before decisions have been finalized, and make revisions to the proofs as required.

From the first day of this process the OPP is responsible for security at the Frost Building, where the budget goes through its drafts, and at Carswell Printing Co., which has the contract to print the budget. This security arrangement is a long-standing one. Until this occasion, that process has worked well. In addition to special OPP security at the Carswell plant, the tender for the printer includes this clause, which I quote:

The printer is required to, "Guarantee absolute security and secrecy of any and all parts of this job while in his possession, e.g. manuscript, galley proofs and page proofs, printed sheets and folded sheets. Any spoiled parts must be shredded immediately."

Let us review what has happened here. Draft documents which the reporters allege may have formed part of an earlier draft of my budget have apparently been picked out of the garbage at the commercial printing establishment by a Globe and Mail employee. There is no suggestion that any material related to the budget came from me or any member of my staff.

As of today, final decisions have not been made on the 1983 budget, nor have final drafts been printed. I have now directed that the budget preparation process be revised and that the entire production of the budget, including reproduction, be transferred to the Treasury building where it will be under the strict control of my staff. I have asked my staff to report to me by Monday on whether or not logistical changes will require me to delay the presentation of my budget. I will inform the House of my decision on Monday.

In addition, I would like to put on the record the statement that was issued by Mr. John Mullin:

"Carswell Printing Co. has maintained the best possible methods of ensuring secrecy in relation to the printing of the provincial budget, which it has done for many years. These security measures are under the supervision of the Ontario Provincial Police and have been approved by them. They include the shredding of all scrap. It appears, however, that a few proofs of pages were placed in garbage which was not shredded but which remained on the printing plant property. These scraps were searched for and removed by a reporter or reporters who

quite improperly trespassed and invaded the plant property and searched the garbage which was still the property of the printing company. Consideration is being given to instituting proceedings for theft."

ORAL QUESTIONS

BUDGET CHANGES

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Treasurer. In the Globe and Mail of today he is quoted as saying that he had finished the budget. Yesterday he apparently said he was still doing some rewriting of the text but was making no changes in the figures. He purportedly said that three days ago. Is that quote correct or not?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, at about 11:30 yesterday morning I was talking to at least one reporter on this matter. I said to him I had the second draft I had seen of the text of the budget as opposed to budget papers. Those budget papers this year, as I may have explained, are being bound separately simply to have flexibility. That was decided six months ago—no, three months ago.

11:50 p.m.

At that point I was making a number of structural changes to the phraseology and as a matter of fact following that, at the request of one minister who was privy to a program, I made a program change. That was at the specific request of one minister who wished me to remove something. That was done.

Mr. Peterson: Just so I understand, because there is a lot of confusion over the sequence of the details here, is the Treasurer saying it is incorrect that three days ago he had finished his budget? He is making changes. Is that what the minister is saying to the House, or is it his intention to change the figures further?

Hon. F. S. Miller: For example, I had no idea the program which I had included and which I thought had been approved by a minister, when passed by him yesterday was not approved by him. That made a change which I did not expect to make. If the honourable member says three days ago, I would say that on Monday morning I was still working on figures and made a number of changes because I had some legal requirements with the government of Canada for certain notices, and those changes were coming fairly late in the day. I had left open the possibility of change but it is factually correct to

say I had not planned any more dollar and cent changes.

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, does the fact that the Treasurer has decided to change the method of production and reproduction of the budget, and transfer it to the Treasury offices themselves, indicate that the previous measures taken were inadequate or that there was a problem with them? Does he not feel a sense of personal responsibility for the deficiencies in security which appear to have taken place?

Hon. Mr. Miller: Mr. Speaker, if any papers are available anywhere through any means obviously the system of security broke down. I would think that answers the question the member raised. Am I responsible? For all of the lecturing that has gone on this morning, some of it serious, some of it a bit pious, I would suggest to the member I have never ever taken my responsibility lightly, nor assumed that I, as Treasurer, was not responsible.

Mr. Peterson: Do we have the Treasurer's assurance or is the Treasurer making any further changes to his budget? In addition to that, is there any additional material missing that was not quoted in the press? Has he made inquiries to that extent, and is, in fact, what was printed in the *Globe and Mail* correct?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I would have to go through the *Globe and Mail* in great detail to make sure if it were correct or not. Because I was given a set of pages which looked very much like many other pages—I do not have them all memorized—I was trying to decide whether they were part of the budget document, whether they were part of the budget papers or whether they were part of the estimates being printed by the Management Board of Cabinet.

Several of those possibilities appeared to be open when I saw the first documents yesterday. Therefore, I cannot categorically say everything is correct or that it is not correct, nor do I wish at this point to speculate, because if I tell the honourable members what is right or wrong at this point I have committed a breach of confidence in the budget.

Mr. Peterson: Having been able to solve the logistical problems of transferring the printing back to the Treasury department—assuming he can do that—is it the Treasurer's intention to go ahead on Tuesday?

Hon. F. S. Miller: It is my current intention to go ahead on Tuesday and the reasoning is this: I believe I have taken the minimum possible time

between Mr. Lalonde's budget and the mechanics of having mine adjusted to match his. I believe the economy of this province deserves a budget as soon as possible. I would not like to see the budget process delayed and I would like to say I intend to deliver that budget as Treasurer.

Mr. Peterson: I assume the Treasurer admits to saying—because I heard the tape—"I thought that the rules were such that one had to quit after that sort of thing." That was his response to the Lalonde indiscretion. Is the Treasurer telling us now in this House that he does not believe his indiscretion, or the mistakes made in his ministry, were similar and that he has absolutely no responsibility?

Is he telling us he does not have any obligation to honour his own advice to the federal finance minister? Does he not feel he has a responsibility to resign, given his responsibility for the security of the documents as well as their contents?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I am going to be giving that continuing thought. I believe what I said in a very brief press conference last night was that I would deliver the budget before considering any alternatives to resignation or staying on in office. I intend to do that.

I suggest there is a great deal of difference between what appears at this point to have been something that was less than legal in a mechanism for obtaining information and the direct holding of a current budget in the hand of a minister in front of a camera. I suggest there is a big difference.

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, in the second paragraph on page 2 of the Treasurer's statement he says he is not going to comment on any of the specifics of the budget. However, he wants to tell us the drafts that were there did not appear to be from final drafts of his budget, nor could they have been since final decisions have not yet been made. Is the Treasurer telling us he intends to make further changes now as a result of the information having been disclosed?

Hon. F. S. Miller: No, Mr. Speaker, not on the basis of what the member alleges to be the disclosure of information.

This year, I deliberately left the printing process with roughly a 24-hour time span between printing and delivery so that I could make changes right up to that point, based upon economic need or other tax matters.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Mr. Speaker, in view of all this, does the Treasurer not think it is time he

changed the whole budgetary process? Should he not make it a more open situation and accept some of the very valid and positive remarks of the Leader of the Opposition and even myself on the whole matter of producing the budget and putting it forward? Does he not feel a lot of these things could be avoided if we brought the budgetary process in Ontario into the 1980s?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend and certain members of his party are very good parliamentarians. I have learned to respect them. I would think they should understand there is a difference between the British system and the American system which he appears to want us to emulate.

In the American system, there is a committee that does peruse and adjust budgets. In the British system, a government is held responsible for a budget provided by a finance minister. I have to take that basic responsibility and I share that with very few colleagues. It is then brought forward to this House and a government is either defeated or upheld on the basis of the budget. It is not a shared responsibility in the British system.

Mr. Rae: There is a serious question here which has to be dealt with. I think it is a question of what is a budget and what is a budget leak.

According to what the Treasurer is telling us, the budget is entirely a movable feast and can be different on Wednesday from what it was on Tuesday and different on Tuesday from what it was on Monday and so on through the weekend, back and forth. If that is so, there can never be any such thing as a leak of budgetary information, according to what the Treasurer is telling us. It would always be possible for him and his ministry to change the budget once certain information has been revealed.

In that respect, is it or is it not the intention of the government to raise Ontario health insurance plan premiums by five per cent? Is that a feature of the budget that is set in stone? We are entitled to an answer to that question. Is that or is that not a feature of the budget?

Hon. F. S. Miller: The member will discover that on Tuesday.

Mr. Rae: What we will discover on Tuesday is whether or not the Treasurer and the cabinet, after meeting about this matter, have decided to change their minds once the information has been made public. That is what we are going to find out on Tuesday and that is a very different thing.

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

12 noon

Mr. Rae: I would like to ask the Treasurer to answer directly: Did he or did he not tell members of the press earlier this week that the budget was finished? Did he or did he not say he had finished his budget?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Yes, I did. I also tell the member that since that time I had to change it because of forces that existed before I even knew of this leak. Therefore, I had to change it after thinking it was complete.

Mr. Conway: Mr. Speaker, the Treasurer himself has admitted in the public press that there are documents awash in the city of Toronto that, to quote him, "could ruin his life." He has admitted here this morning that he has not yet had an opportunity to complete the inventory of lost or missing material. We can understand how difficult that might be.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is impossible.

Mr. Conway: The Premier says it is impossible.

My question to the Treasurer is, how can he plan to go forward in three days' time to introduce a budget in this House that may have been breached in ways that the Treasurer this morning and in the intervening hours may not be able to satisfy himself about? How is that going to be possible? How is he going to know when he stands in his place here on Tuesday that some of this information has not disseminated beyond the immediate confines of Queen's Park?

Hon. F. S. Miller: The point I was trying to make, Mr. Speaker, was that once I read my budget you will know whether there was or was not a leak and you can hold me accountable.

Mr. Rae: With respect, the record will show the Treasurer has told us there was a leak. I would say to him the only person who knows as of today whether there has been a leak is the Treasurer, and what was a leak on Friday may well prove not to be a leak on Tuesday if the government decides to change the budget.

Does the Treasurer not feel that the whole budgetary process has been flawed and that the credibility of the budget has been seriously undermined as a result of what has happened? Does he not think he now has an obligation to start again? I suggest he should step down from his position and let someone else start the process over again until we determine by means of a parliamentary committee precisely what

has happened with respect to this extraordinary leak.

Hon. F. S. Miller: The police are investigating what happened. I would like to know what the police find. I think that is important. Once they have had a chance to complete an investigation, I suspect we will learn in this House what the results of that investigation are. Until that happens I do not want to speculate.

As to the rest of it, I believe, and I hope the member believes, it is important right now to have a budget brought forward. It is in the interests of the unemployed about whom he talks quite a bit. It is in the interest of the economy. I believe I have many measures not hinted at anywhere that are of use to the people in this province who need help.

BUDGETARY PROCESS

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the Treasurer can tell us, since he has admitted there has been a leak, whether he has any idea if there are any more. Does he know whether there is any other information floating around? Is he going to wake up tomorrow morning to discover that more information has been leaked?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, that is a one-sided alternative. I do not know what I do not know.

Mr. Rae: I am not sure the Treasurer knows what he knows, and that is the problem. He certainly is not telling us what he knows, and that is another problem.

I ask the Treasurer in all seriousness whether he does not feel the credibility of this budgetary process has been undermined. Does he not feel that the publication of this information with respect to the five per cent Ontario hospital insurance plan premium increase, with respect to the cutbacks in expenditure on the Ministry of Industry and Trade and the Ministry of Agriculture and Food, the prepublication of that kind of information in itself, taints the entire budgetary process?

Does he not feel it is important that we start again with a fresh Treasurer and with a fresh approach rather than proceed in a manner that is going to leave so many questions unanswered, because he is the only one who is in a position to answer them?

Hon. F. S. Miller: First of all, the member asks about the process. I suggest that perhaps I have lost just a little confidence in the collection of news and what in fact is a legitimate way to go about collecting news. He talks about the bud-

get process having been depreciated. I suggest to him that when somebody comes to me and says, "I was testing the security of your system," that is not what I consider the normal technique of collecting news. I have no idea what will be found. If one deliberately sets out either to break the law or to find ways and means of obtaining otherwise well-guarded information, I do not think that is the normal technique that has been used by what I think are very fine people in the press gallery.

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, is it now fair to say the Treasurer's position is that he has rejected the time-honoured tradition and responsibility that the Treasurer is responsible not only for the contents but also for the security of the budget document? Is it now his position that he is not responsible for the security of those documents? Is that what he is telling this House?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, what I said was that the members will not know what my budget is until I deliver it. They will then have an opportunity to assess whether they believe there were genuine leaks. I have never tried to say I am not responsible for the process. I am not sure about, and I have not had legal advice on, the extension of that responsibility to purloined information.

Mr. Peterson: It is a moral question. You don't have any moral counsellors over there.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, on a matter of privilege: If that gentleman thinks I find this easy or that I have somehow lost my moral competence in this, I suggest he does not know how I have felt for the past 12 hours.

Mr. Rae: I simply say the Treasurer is the only person in this House who knows as of today whether there has been a leak. That is why the question becomes one of personal honour. The Treasurer today is the only person in a position to know whether there has been a leak; that puts a particular onus on him to make a decision.

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

Mr. Rae: If the Treasurer is not prepared to make a decision on resignation today, which I regret, is he at least prepared to see that as of today this entire matter is referred to the standing committee on procedural affairs?

Hon. F. S. Miller: No, Mr. Speaker. I simply suggest this: I have a responsibility and a duty to bring forward a budget. I see that the highest needs of the province will be served by doing that. I have not in any way tried to say I will not be considering whatever responsibilities I may

have once the member sees the document. I want the member to see that document. I want it to be in effect so we can at least start the actions that are contained in it.

BUDGET SECURITY

Mr. Conway: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Treasurer. God only knows what else is missing. Surely that is the point. That is the real concern. We do not know what is missing and we are going to get a budget that may be compromised because of that ignorance.

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

Mr. Conway: My question to the Treasurer deals with the second paragraph of his statement: "I will begin by sharing with the members the sequence of events that took place yesterday afternoon. First, members of my Treasury staff were alerted Thursday afternoon of apparent attempts to breach security at the premises of Carswell Printing Co. where I had planned to have the budget printed."

At exactly what time and by whom were his Treasury officials notified? Can he now share with the members of this House the specifics of what that breach of security was alleged to have been?

Hon. F. S. Miller: No, Mr. Speaker. I suggest the Solicitor General (Mr. G. W. Taylor) has pointed out to me that his own investigations are more likely to succeed if I or others do not speculate on, or give information about, the information in his hands.

Mr. Conway: As he knows and I am sure understands, that really makes the job of the official opposition and all members who are inquiring into this situation very difficult.

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

Mr. Conway: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Don't you want to get at the truth?

Mr. Conway: The Premier says, "Don't you want to get at the truth?"

Mr. Speaker: Never mind the interjections.

Mr. Conway: Yes, we do; and of course the wall of sub judice has been put before us many times before.

Hon. Mr. Davis: We haven't mentioned that. 12:10 p.m.

Mr. Conway: Given the Treasurer's rather unique and personal view of the essential and central convention of ministerial responsibility, can he explain to me and to this House why,

after having been told some time late yesterday afternoon that this storm was about to break, he did not come to this House last evening at eight o'clock or some time thereafter to give members of this assembly an indication of what was taking place and what kind of initiative he was undertaking with the Solicitor General to protect this most sacred of government processes and documents?

Why did the Treasurer not retire from Napoleon's restaurant last evening just long enough to share at least that much with the members of this assembly gathered in evening session, as I think he ought to have?

Hon. F. S. Miller: The question as to whether anything at all should have been said last night was discussed. I had been told by the Globe and Mail at approximately 6:15 p.m. that it would publish information last night. I had no reason not to believe that was so. By eight o'clock, I was aware of certain information in the Globe and Mail.

At that point I felt it was just as wise to let the rest of the press gallery know that was happening and that I would have the information for a statement this morning once I had a chance to look through some of the material. If the honourable member went through what was very short advice to that group of approximately four or five reporters, he would discover I simply told them a story was being printed that night and I would be checking its authenticity and checking the documents purported to be from my budget.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I was certain I heard the Treasurer on the Metro Morning interview this morning indicate that the Ontario Provincial Police was responsible for the security measures surrounding the budget, and I notice in his statement to the House he has now said the OPP is responsible for part of the security. Will he tell the House who is responsible for the security and what agencies of government share that responsibility?

Hon. F. S. Miller: It is not an agency of government, Mr. Speaker. In fact, it is in my statement, which I read to members, that the printer has responsibilities; that is, he shares part of the responsibility.

BUDGET PRINTING CONTRACT

Mr. Cooke: Mr. Speaker, on page 3 of the Treasurer's statement he says: "The printer is required to 'guarantee absolute security and secrecy of any or all parts of this job while in his

possession, e.g. manuscript, galley proofs and page proofs, printed sheets and folded sheets. Any spoiled parts must be shredded immediately."

That is a contract the Treasurer signed with the printer. It was a part of the tender put out by his ministry. If that is what he expects of the printer, whose responsibility is it to make sure the contract is fully and totally carried out?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I think the contract is signed by the Ministry of Government Services as the major manager of that type of purchase and it is done on behalf of Treasury. Any time a contract is tendered, there are performance requirements. It does not matter whether one is building a building or printing a book. If there is a breakdown in the performance from one point of view or another, usually there are some penalty clauses or other actions one can take. There has appeared to be a breakdown in that clause. I do not know what actions will be taken. I will be awaiting legal advice on that matter.

Mr. Cooke: I am sure the Treasurer approves the specifications for his contracts on matters of budgetary tendering. Is the Treasurer saying to us that it is not his responsibility to make sure this contract is fulfilled? Is he saying the security breakdown does not come back to him, or is he now saying it is the responsibility of the Minister of Government Services (Mr. Wiseman) or perhaps the Solicitor General? Where does the responsibility lie in this parliament?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Obviously the police are involved. I assume the police report first to their minister and secondly to me. I am held accountable, as are ministers of the crown on the collegial basis for our actions. In no way am I trying to put that on anybody else. I think the honourable member is trying to make it look as if I am; I am not.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, was the minister personally briefed on the security aspects of farming the job out to an outside printer? If he is not now satisfied, for obvious reasons, how can he so conveniently move it back into the Treasury building, where it probably should have been in the first instance?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, this is my fifth budget. In terms of being briefed on security arrangements, since I believe the same printer has been used each time, I was briefed earlier and I was rebriefed after this incident for refreshment.

There are lots of things that can be done

in-house at greater cost. We had no reason in the first 10 years to have any reason to believe the security measures were not adequate. We found the efficiency and cost of the outside firm to be to our advantage and therefore we used it. Now that security is probably seen to be more important than cost, we are bringing it back in-house with some difficulty.

BUDGET CHANGES

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, it has been said by two or three members that the Treasurer is the only one who knows whether a valid leak has occurred. He is reported in the *Globe and Mail* yesterday as having assured that the figures were final, without any equivocation. He has now gone back on that and has said one specific program had been changed because of an oversight in one of the ministries.

Can he tell this House whether the figures we have all read in the *Globe and Mail* are part of the budget as it was established in his mind before the leak, if it was a leak? If he has assured himself of that, is it his intention that those figures will be changed?

Hon. Mr. Miller: No, I cannot, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Nixon: This is the catch 22 we face. There is only one person who knows whether there was a leak. It is really completely invalid to say one has to see what is in the budget to know whether a leak has occurred. The minister is personally responsible for this and he knows the course of action that is necessary. For him to say that if he comments on that in any way, he simply reveals the contents of the budget ahead of time is the worst kind of sophistry I have ever heard.

The minister has stated clearly that it has nothing whatsoever to do with how the information becomes public. When a leak occurs, he has only one course of action. Does he not see that in his own mind, if a leak has occurred, his resignation must be put in the hands of the Premier?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I am aware of the rules.

OHIP PREMIUMS

Mr. McClellan: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Treasurer. Is it not a fact that his government raises more money through the Ontario health insurance plan premium than it does through corporation taxes and that it is a major source of revenue for this government? Can he tell us again, because we still do not understand, whether the five per cent increase

in the OHIP premium, allegedly a leak from his budget in today's *Globe and Mail*, is a leak from his budget?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I said I will not comment on that.

Mr. McClellan: We went through this same episode three weeks ago in Ottawa and it cost the taxpayers of Canada \$200 million to save Marc Lalonde's neck. Can I have some assurance from the Treasurer that the people of this province are not going to have to pay through the nose in the form of even higher OHIP premiums as a result of what has happened with his budget?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I cannot make a comment on it. I would like to point out to the honourable member that OHIP premiums do not even have to be in the budget. They are subject to regulatory change.

Mr. O'Neil: Mr. Speaker, from his discussion of the leaks and from his discussions with the reporters from the *Globe and Mail*, can the Treasurer tell us whether they have additional information that will be printed, or was that the total amount they got from the garbage bag?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I have answered that question previously. I do not know.

12:20 p.m.

ASSISTANCE TO FARMERS

Mr. Riddell: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Agriculture and Food. Is the minister aware that some of the lending institutions are telling some of the farmers they will not honour the guaranteed line of credit portion of the Ontario farm adjustment assistance program because the Ministry of Agriculture and Food itself is going to guarantee only a certain portion?

With the announcement in the budget leak that there will be a 13 per cent reduction in the agriculture budget, is the minister not concerned that the lending institutions now are going to take a very firm stand and say to the farmers, "It is obvious that the government has very little commitment to the agriculture industry, so why should we risk giving you a new line of credit?"

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, I remind the honourable member that in the recess between the extended fall sitting of the Legislature and the resumption of the House I met with representatives of the major chartered banks to discuss the question of credit to the agriculture industry, specifically to the part of the industry

that concerns the member in his question, the farmers.

The net result of those many meetings was a clear conclusion, stated by them to me, that they see agriculture as a continuing priority, an industry in which they want to continue to be involved and in which they see a growth in activity in 1983—that is to say, they would foresee extending more credit to agriculture in 1983 than in 1982.

In addition, I think it is fair to say, not only from my private meetings with the banks but also from statements attributed to them in their appearances recently before a parliamentary committee of the House of Commons and from statements of the bankers' association, that they see the farm adjustment assistance program in this province as an example of how governments, the lending community—which is broader, of course, than just the banks; as the member knows, it involves credit unions and trust companies as well—and the agricultural community can work together.

To go to the opening part of the member's question, if he has specific cases about which he is concerned, the door, as he knows, is always open. He frequently sends me over notes about individual cases, and they are always tracked down.

We pride ourselves in the ministry that, as much as or perhaps more than any other ministry, we do deal very fairly with individual cases. One of the member's colleagues, the member for Grey (Mr. McKessock), gave me a case just yesterday, as a matter of fact, which we will begin to look into today and, I hope, be able to resolve.

Mr. McGuigan: Mr. Speaker, the minister just said the parties can work together, yet I mentioned earlier a case where the bank has said, "We will go on with the bank's recommendation and the OFAAP recommendation only if you sign this agreement to go into voluntary liquidation a year from now." How is the minister dealing with such cases? I know of one case that has been brought to his attention.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: On an individual basis, Mr. Speaker. There are well over 80,000 farmers out there. To date, we have about 3,700, I guess, who have been or are involved in the farm adjustment assistance program. No two cases are exactly the same; we have to deal with them on an individual basis.

If the honourable member has not already drawn that individual's case to my attention or to the attention of my deputy minister or

members of my staff, I wish he would do so because, as I have said, the offer is totally open to all members of this House—indeed, to anybody concerned about an individual farmer's financial situation—to track down on an individual basis all of the facts and, where possible, to assist in achieving a resolution.

Mr. Swart: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that loans to farmers will have been put on hold as of last night, and, oh yes, in view of the urgency and the need for farmers in even the next three or four days to have assurances of those loans, has the minister been in touch or will he be in touch with the banks to express any displeasure about putting those loans on hold because of the budget leak?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, with respect, the honourable member is really building something of a straw man. He knows that the farm adjustment assistance program has been extended through 1983. He knows, surely, although I cannot recall his drawing any individual cases to my attention, that we are in touch on a daily basis with the lending institutions—I use that broader term because it is more than just a bank; there are a number of trust companies and credit unions which are also part of OFAAP.

I have absolutely no reason whatsoever to believe, nor should the member—he is raising a spectre which will unnecessarily concern some people—that the information quoted in today's press will in any way, shape or form, influence any lender's decision.

Mr. Swart: The Minister of Agriculture and Food is out of touch with regard to the loan situation relative to farmers and the jeopardy they are in.

Mr. Speaker, I have a new question to the Treasurer on the same subject. My understanding of his position on the budget leak is that he will not confirm the accuracy or inaccuracy or the degree thereof of the budget provision, as reported by the *Globe and Mail*. I think that is an accurate interpretation of what he said.

Irrespective of the accuracy, does the Treasurer not think that a 13 per cent decrease in assistance to agriculture would be a major economic mistake and would demonstrate an unconscionable degree of heartlessness towards the plight of the farmers?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, my friend the member jumps to conclusions. I would suggest he should see the details before he makes any assessments of what is happening in the budget.

Mr. Swart: Now that the situation is changed from when the leaked budget was in preparation, now that there will be no race among the ministers for the Premier's chair and now that there is no need for the Treasurer to undercut any of his colleagues, including the Minister of Agriculture and Food, will the Treasurer give this House the assurance that the final budget which will come before us here on Tuesday will, far from containing reductions, contain substantial increases for agriculture?

Hon. F. S. Miller: The member will know on Tuesday.

Mr. Conway: Mr. Speaker, just so that we are clear: The Treasurer intends to proceed with the budget on Tuesday afternoon at four o'clock, even though he by then may not have satisfied himself that he has fully contained the leak. Is that a correct understanding?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, they are speculating on a leak. I am making no more comments on it.

Mr. Speaker: The Solicitor General has the answer to a previously asked question.

DEATHS AT HOSPITAL FOR SICK CHILDREN

Hon. G. W. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, as the honourable members will recall, on April 28 I advised them of an investigation into the death of a child at the cardiac ward of the Hospital for Sick Children. The investigation by the Metropolitan Toronto Police began on April 24 after consultation with Dr. Bennett, the chief coroner. Elevated levels of digoxin were found.

A team of scientists at the Centre of Forensic Sciences has conducted further tests. The investigating officers have met with Dr. Bennett and his staff, Dr. Hastreiter and Dr. Kaufman, experts in the field of paediatrics and digoxin, and with crown counsel and the Deputy Solicitor General.

I have now received a report of the results of the meetings from Dr. Bennett and my deputy, Mr. McLeod, and can advise members that, after receiving both medical and legal advice, the police are satisfied the case should not be treated as a homicide. Accordingly, the events surrounding this death will be the subject of an inquest, which has been set for Tuesday, May 24, 1983.

I can also advise the members that Dr. James Young, the regional coroner for Metropolitan Toronto, will be conducting the inquest.

12:30 p.m.

Ms. Copps: Mr. Speaker, can the minister assure this House that there will be no limitations placed on the coroner's inquest? Can he tell us if relevant portions of the report of the Atlanta Centers for Disease Control, which do not point the finger at individuals but deal with the whole issue of digoxin, will be tabled so that the coroner and the people involved can have a look at all the information relevant to the toxic and lethal levels of digoxin?

Hon. G. W. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, when a coroner conducts an investigation there is a statutory duty upon that coroner to seek out the information he or she feels is necessary to continue the investigation. I am sure the honourable member would not want me to direct the coroner as to what information he is to look at and what he is not to look at. It is an investigative hearing conducted by the coroner as a hearing officer.

The experienced regional coroner from Metropolitan Toronto, Dr. James Young, will make the determination of what he needs to investigate that death. As I said, I am sure the member would not want me putting in anything that would probably be described at that point as political interference on this very important hearing matter before the coroner.

BUDGET CHANGES

Mr. Foulds: Mr. Speaker, the Treasurer admitted this morning that there has been a leak of material to the public. He has admitted that substantial material has become public. He has admitted that material is related to the budgetary process. Can he tell us if the rewriting that is taking place at this moment and that will take place throughout the weekend in the Treasury offices will have absolutely nothing to do with the incident of this material becoming public last night and with the material that has been made public and released to the public?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, the member is on a flight of fancy. He can speculate as much as he wishes. I will make no commitments.

Mr. Foulds: In the material that has been made public, it has been indicated that there is a cut in the Ministry of Industry and Trade expenditure of 37 per cent. Can the minister confirm whether that has been contemplated at any time in the budgetary process? Can he confirm whether that is the thrust of his budgetary policy? How can he justify that in terms of the job creation that is so necessary in the province at this time?

Hon. F. S. Miller: As I said to the member for Welland-Thorold (Mr. Swart), do not jump to conclusions until you see the budget.

Mr. Foulds: You will be rewriting history, Frank. You are pulling a Lalonde.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Wrye: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Treasurer a question that has been asked in a slightly different way. Can he inform us what assurances, after he became aware of the leak—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Wrye: Can the Treasurer inform us what assurances he sought from the reporters or from the newspaper involved, after he became aware of what he described as a leak in this House this morning, as to what other aspects of the budget the newspaper or the reporters may have, what documents they may still have in their possession?

What assurance has he sought to make sure they have no additional material so that no aspects of the budget he is to present on Tuesday, which may be favourable to insider knowledge, could result in financial gain? Is he satisfied, and has he sought assurances, that the Globe and Mail has no other leaked documents?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, that is the third time the question has been asked. I do not know.

CUTBACKS IN EXTENSION PROGRAMS

Mr. G. I. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Agriculture and Food. In view of the leaky budget that came out last night and the cutback of 13 per cent that has been estimated in the report, I have received several letters from various women's institutes and other groups expressing concern about cutbacks in extension programs such as 4-H—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. G. I. Miller: —short courses and home economics adult courses—

Interjections.

Ms. Copps: Order.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Order.

Mr. G. I. Miller: —currently provided by the Ministry of Agriculture and Food. Is the minister planning on making cutbacks in these programs under the new rural organization and services branch of his ministry?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I did not catch the question.

Mr. G. I. Miller: I will run the question by him one more time. I have received many letters from various women's institutes and other groups expressing concern about cutbacks in extension programs such as 4-H short courses, services provided to the rural community and adult home economics courses currently provided by his ministry. Are there going to be cutbacks in those services to the rural areas of Ontario through his ministry?

Mr. Riddell: It took you three months to appoint an agricultural representative in Middlesex county.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Is the member displeased with the decision?

Mr. Riddell: No, I am pleased with it.

Mr. Speaker: Never mind the interjections please.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: The member is happy we took the time to make sure we found the right individual.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Haldimand-Norfolk has been recognized.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, I will not deal with that. I will deal with that on Monday night when I am in Huron-Middlesex.

The ministry is making no plans to cut such services. In the reorganization of the ministry and the creation of the rural organization services branch, it has been our intention all along not only to maintain the services to the rural community, but within the bounds of our budget and our staffing to try if anything to be of more service to the rural community.

In the next couple of days the member should receive a memorandum I have sent to all members of the House outlining the distribution of staff in both the agricultural representatives branch and the rural organizational services branch. The members will see, when they get that memorandum, that we are maintaining, not cutting, services to the rural community.

Mr. G. I. Miller: Can the minister assure us there will be no cutback in staff at the local offices such as the ag rep offices at Cayuga and Norfolk and in other areas around Ontario? Can he assure us there will be no cutback in the staff and that service will be provided?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I do not have the memorandum here and I cannot recall each individual office. There have already been some redistributions depending on the work load. Some counties are more demanding, have a heavier

work load for certain services, and as always there will be some redistribution of staff in that regard. To answer the question, we are not planning to cut services to the rural communities.

Mr. Swart: Mr. Speaker, if the leak proves to be true and there is going to be a 13 per cent cutback in his overall budget, in which departments of his ministry will he make the cuts?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to discuss any aspect of my ministry both after the budget next week and when we start estimates on June 1, rather than dealing in hypotheses based on press speculation.

FUNDING FOR MINISTERIAL PROGRAMS

Mr. Mackenzie: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Industry and Trade. Now that the minister is aware he may be facing a 37 per cent cut in his ministry, can he tell us what programs he would cut to accommodate such a reduction in his funding?

Hon. Mr. Walker: Mr. Speaker, anyone with any understanding of the ministry and of the budgetary process would realize there is probably a distortion within the system from the point of view of purchases made by the ministry that were attributed to the ministry last year, which this House passed and that would relate to statutory decisions made by this House.

I have nothing further to relate to that. I cannot tell the member what is in the budget. I do not know that. None of the ministers is aware of the details of the budget. However, by a simple cursory look at the estimates of the ministry and of the infusions of a statutory grant during the last year, one would come to the conclusion immediately that the member is totally off base in the question he is now posing.

12:40 p.m.

Mr. Mackenzie: With the desperate need for jobs in Ontario today, would the minister not agree that any savings he is talking about would be more than offset by the need for job creation programs and assistance to industry that is going to create jobs from his ministry? Can he assure us there will not be any cuts and that additional funds will be available for job creation in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Walker: The budget will be what it is and the estimates will be what they are. I suggest the member should go back and take a look at what has been passed by this House and by him specifically in recent years. He will finally come to the conclusion about how any figures might be arrived at. The member is not

doing much on his research. He had better take a look at it. He is digging in a little further than he should on it.

Mr. Sweeney: Mr. Speaker, the minister has indicated he has no idea what is in the budget for his ministry. Yet the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) indicated 10 or 15 minutes ago that some minister came to him and wanted a program change, so obviously he must have some idea.

The information is now out there that somehow, some way, 37 per cent is going to be cut out of the minister's budget. I think the minister would have to agree that could be interpreted, correctly or not, as a cut in research and development, a cut in productivity gains or a cut in employment opportunities.

We still have three or four days and there are people out there who could be employed, who could be making market decisions, who could be making investment decisions. Can the minister assure us those are not the places where his share of the budget is going to be cut? Can he make that claim?

Hon. Mr. Walker: Mr. Speaker, I think the member is digging himself in deeper and deeper. What he had better do is go back and have a look at his figures from last year. One look at them and he will know the answer to his question. Both these members have to do better research.

HYDRO CONTRACTS

Mr. Kerrio: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Energy regarding another obvious bit of mismanagement on the part of Ontario Hydro. I am referring specifically to the 15-year contracts with Petrosar that amount to roughly \$1 billion and which have already cost Ontario consumers some \$60 million for not taking oil.

Can the minister tell us why there has been no allocation in Ontario Hydro's submission to the Ontario Energy Board relating to this cost? Is he aware that if the \$105-million lawsuit by Petrosar under the contract is successful there could be an increase in Ontario Hydro rates of up to 12 per cent rather than 9.7 per cent? The minister might also share with the House what it might cost to cancel these atrocious contracts with Petrosar for oil we do not need.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I just have one or two observations in response to the question from my learned friend.

I suppose it is always comfortable to be able to second-guess decisions that were taken some

years ago by people who were charged with the responsibility to ensure there was a security of supply for the fuels that would be needed so that the people of this province would have an uninterrupted source of electricity.

Whatever judgement may be brought to bear on the wisdom of those earlier decisions, the honourable member will also know that this contract is the subject of litigation. Thus it would be improper for me to speculate with respect to the outcome of that until such time as the litigation has been dealt with.

Mr. Kerrio: The minister should be able to recall us questioning Hydro on uranium contracts and other important contracts relating to supply of the basic fuels for Ontario Hydro. I certainly do not go along with his comments on the future guarantee of oil. He knows very well our sister provinces out west have an abundance of natural gas and much of this oil did not have to be bargained for so far in advance. We know now it was an incredibly bad deal.

Would the minister consider tabling the contract and also consider reconstituting the select committee, so that this committee of the Legislature could do some of the very worthwhile things that were done during a minority government, when it seemed the government was more willing to be answerable to the people of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Perhaps the member will have an opportunity to look over his question in Hansard and will perhaps then be able to appreciate the chronology.

I am sure that at the time of the negotiations with respect to the oil supply, the adequacy of relying on natural gas was very much in question. The member will know the history with respect to those developments. I am not that far back, perhaps, in the energy history of this province.

However, I repeat what I said, this matter is now being litigated and I think it would be wise to await the outcome of that before offering any further comments in response to the member's question.

BUDGET PRINTING CONTRACT

Mr. Philip: Mr. Speaker, will the Treasurer ask the Minister of Government Services (Mr. Wiseman) to table the printing contract with Carswell Printing? Will he reveal what penalties exist for breach of the contract, particularly breach of the security provisions of that contract?

Mr. Foulds: Doug, that's you; Minister of Government Services.

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: No, it was to the Treasurer. Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Would you ask the Minister of Government Services to investigate the contract to see what provisions were made—for security?

Mr. Philip: I will repeat the question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: All right.

Mr. Philip: Will the Treasurer ask the Minister of Government Services to table the contract with Carswell Printing? Will he reveal what penalties exist, if any, for breach of that contract, particularly the security provisions of that contract?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I will consult with him to see if that is in order.

Mr. Philip: Can the Treasurer tell us whether or not there are penalties for breach of the contract? Can he tell us whether there are any documents other than the contract, such as ministerial guidelines or memoranda of understanding, with that company? Most important, will the documents be tabled in this House?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I answered the last part first. I do not know the answer to the penalties. I assume there are always some ways and means of recovering costs if a contract is not properly completed.

Mr. Ruston: Mr. Speaker, what steps did the Treasurer take when he heard on Wednesday that there was some problem with the security at the printing office?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, it was Thursday when I learned about it. I do not want to make any comments. I do that on the advice of the Solicitor General (Mr. G. W. Taylor).

BUDGET ADVICE

Mr. Conway: Mr. Speaker, I have a final question to the leader of the government, because the leader of the government must surely know from his long experience in the assembly that what we have witnessed here in the last 18 hours is unprecedented in the long and distinguished parliamentary traditions of the Ontario Legislature.

Does the leader of the government not share with all honourable members a sense of deep concern about the impact not only of this leak but also of the rather exceptional reaction to it by his Minister of Treasury and Economics?

What specific advice will the leader of the government be tendering to the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) over the next 72 hours, as he tries to prepare a budget for delivery here at 4 p.m. on the afternoon of Tuesday next, in the event that the Treasurer cannot isolate and contain the leaks, which he himself has indicated this morning he has no control over at this time?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, because the time has run out, I will be tendering just one word of advice to the Treasurer and that advice will very simply be this: I have confidence in him, I have respect for his integrity, I think he is a great minister of the crown, and I will tell him that so he can mull it over in the next 72 hours.

ALL-ONTARIO PITCH-IN DAY

Mr. G. I. Miller: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege: The All-Ontario Pitch-In Day 1983 campaign begins on May 9 and runs to May 15. I wonder if the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Norton) is going to make any comments in regard to supporting this campaign, and are the Minister of Education (Miss Stephenson), the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Pope) and the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Snow) going to be involved in it?

Mr. Speaker: The time for oral questions has expired.

12:50 p.m.

KENTUCKY DERBY

Hon. Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, before the introduction of bills and other matters, I would like to draw the attention of the House to an event that will take place tomorrow featuring a very distinguished Ontario product.

I am sure the members of the House will want to join with me in extending to Mr. Dave Foster, the owner, Mr. David Cross, the trainer and Mr. Eddie Delahoussaye, the jockey, the thought that the hopes of all Canada are with them on—

Mr. R. F. Johnston: I thought that looked like a racing form in your pocket.

Hon. Mr. Drea: If members want to make derogatory remarks about an industry that produces 40,000 jobs in this province, let them go ahead, Mr. Speaker.

The very fact that a breeding industry and a thoroughbred racing industry such as we have in this province, which not only provide jobs but are so important in the preservation of agricultural land, can produce such a distinguished colt as Sunny's Halo is indicative of the tremendous

endeavours of the people in this sector of the agricultural community of this province.

While the horse is being wildly heralded as a Canadian product, it should be underlined that he is a product of Ontario breeding, an industry that has been massively supported by this government, an industry that now is achieving worldwide recognition and providing more jobs, more opportunity and more export sales.

I am sure all members will want to join with me and the government in extending our congratulations, our best wishes, because this particular horse has had a most distinguished winter season. Even if it does not fare as well as it should tomorrow afternoon about six o'clock, the people of Ontario are very proud.

WITHDRAWAL OF MOTION

Mr. Speaker: Before proceeding with the orders of the day, I have been advised by the New Democratic Party House leader that the motion which was going to be submitted by the member for York South (Mr. Rae) has been withdrawn for today and is to be resubmitted for consideration Monday next.

MEMBERS' PRIVILEGES

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I have a point of order. You may recall the circumstances of the House last evening when you were called from your office to take the chair and hear the report of the committee of the whole from its chairman.

After you received the report and had it approved by the House, I attempted to get your ear, as the first opportunity when a matter that I considered of importance could be brought to your attention. For reasons not known to me, you refused even to recognize the fact an honourable member was on the floor trying to get your attention and simply kept repeating that the House was adjourned.

Perhaps you could explain to the House the sequence of events that led up to that. I would just like to say to you, sir, that if you had some strong feeling that nothing of that nature could be raised because of the hour it was quite within your powers to say so.

My own feeling is that in a matter at least one member considered of importance, and I believe was important, it might well have been possible for you to hear the submission. I regret very

much it was not possible to do that and at the time I felt the conduct of your duties did not live up to the standard that, frankly, I have come to expect from you.

It is not for me to criticize, but I felt I had to put that to you and hear your response.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you very much. There was not any mystery and it was a matter of discussion when it became quite obvious that time was going to exceed the normal limit for adjournment.

Mr. Nixon: And had.

Mr. Speaker: And had indeed, yes. I would refer the member to standing order 3(a) and 3(b). The hours of adjournment are set in the standing orders. I do not have any discretion to change those. The only way they can change is by the passage of a government motion for that purpose, but such government motion shall not pass if 20 members choose to oppose it.

It is a matter which is dictated to the Speaker by the standing orders, over which I have no discretion.

Mr. Nixon: If you will permit me, Mr. Speaker, I have just one brief, further comment. In view of the importance of the job you hold, there have been occasions, which may come forward again, when your own judgement in these matters might prevail over a rigid reading of the standing orders, whatever the advice you may receive. I feel quite strongly that you, as a member of the House as well as the Speaker, should know in this instance that I felt my own privileges were not properly safeguarded, and should know the strength of my feeling in that regard.

Mr. Speaker: I appreciate having the member's point of view, but I must point out to all honourable members that I have to have regard for the standing orders no matter who they are applied to, and deal with them in an evenhanded way.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, we will not take the time to go into committee of the whole House and then out, which would be for only a few minutes.

The House adjourned at 12:57 p.m.

APPENDIX

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS*

(125 members)

Third Session of the 32nd Parliament

Lieutenant Governor: Hon. J. B. Aird, OC, QC

Speaker: Hon. John M. Turner

Clerk of the House: Roderick Lewis, QC

- Allen, R. (Hamilton West NDP)
 Andrewes, P. W. (Lincoln PC)
Ashe, Hon. G. L., Minister of Revenue (Durham West PC)
Baetz, Hon. R. C., Minister of Tourism and Recreation (Ottawa West PC)
 Barlow, W. W. (Cambridge PC)
Bennett, Hon. C. F., Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Ottawa South PC)
Bernier, Hon. L., Minister of Northern Affairs (Kenora PC)
Birch, Hon. M., Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Scarborough East PC)
 Boudria, D. (Prescott-Russell L)
 Bradley, J. J. (St. Catharines L)
 Brandt, A. S. (Sarnia PC)
 Breaugh, M. J. (Oshawa NDP)
 Breithaupt, J. R. (Kitchener L)
 Bryden, M. H. (Beaches-Woodbine NDP)
 Cassidy, M. (Ottawa Centre NDP)
 Charlton, B. A. (Hamilton Mountain NDP)
 Conway, S. G. (Renfrew North L)
 Cooke, D. S. (Windsor-Riverside NDP)
 Copps, S. M. (Hamilton Centre L)
 Cousens, D., Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole House (York Centre PC)
 Cunningham, E. G. (Wentworth North L)
 Cureatz, S. L., Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole House (Durham East PC)
Davis, Hon. W. G., Premier (Brampton PC)
 Dean, G. H. (Wentworth PC)
 Di Santo, O. (Downsview NDP)
Drea, Hon. F., Minister of Community and Social Services (Scarborough Centre PC)
 Eakins, J. F. (Victoria-Haliburton L)
Eaton, Hon. R. G., Minister without Portfolio (Middlesex PC)
 Edighoffer, H. A. (Perth L)
Elgie, Hon. R. G., Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (York East PC)
 Elston, M. J. (Huron-Bruce L)
 Epp, H. A. (Waterloo North L)
 Eves, E. L. (Parry Sound PC)
 Fish, S. A. (St. George PC)
 Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP)
 Gillies, P. A. (Brantford PC)
 Gordon, J. K. (Sudbury PC)
 Grande, T. (Oakwood NDP)
Gregory, Hon. M. E. C., Minister without Portfolio (Mississauga East PC)
Grossman, Hon. L. S., Minister of Health (St. Andrew-St. Patrick PC)
 Haggerty, R. (Erie L)
 Harris, M. D. (Nipissing PC)
 Havrot, E. M. (Timiskaming PC)
Henderson, Hon. L. C., Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Lambton PC)
 Hennessy, M. (Fort William PC)
 Hodgson, W. (York North PC)
 Johnson, J. M. (Wellington-Dufferin-Peel PC)
 Johnston, R. F. (Scarborough West NDP)
 Jones, T. (Mississauga North PC)
 Kells, M. C. (Humber PC)
 Kennedy, R. D. (Mississauga South PC)
 Kerr, G. A. (Burlington South PC)
 Kerrio, V. G. (Niagara Falls L)
 Kolyn, A. (Lakeshore PC)
 Lane, J. G. (Algoma-Manitoulin PC)
 Laughren, F. (Nickel Belt NDP)
Leluk, Hon. N. G., Minister of Correctional Services (York West PC)
 Lupusella, A. (Dovercourt NDP)
 Mackenzie, R. W. (Hamilton East NDP)
 MacQuarrie, R. W. (Carleton East PC)
 Mancini, R. (Essex South L)
 Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
McCaffrey, Hon. R. B., Minister of Citizenship and Culture (Armourdale PC)
McCague, Hon. G. R., Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet (Dufferin-Simcoe PC)
 McClellan, R. A. (Bellwoods NDP)
 McEwen, J. E. (Frontenac-Addington L)
 McGuigan, J. F. (Kent-Elgin L)
 McKessock, R. (Grey L)
 McLean, A. K. (Simcoe East PC)
McMurtry, Hon. R. R., Attorney General (Eglinton PC)
 McNeil, R. K. (Elgin PC)

Miller, Hon. F. S., Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics (Muskoka PC)

Miller, G. I. (Haldimand-Norfolk L)

Mitchell, R. C. (Carleton PC)

Newman, B. (Windsor-Walkerville L)

Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)

Norton, Hon. K. C., Minister of the Environment (Kingston and the Islands PC)

O'Neil, H. P. (Quinte L)

Peterson, D. R. (London Centre L)

Philip, E. T. (Etobicoke NDP)

Piché, R. L. (Cochrane North PC)

Pollock, J. (Hastings-Peterborough PC)

Pope, Hon. A. W., Minister of Natural Resources (Cochrane South PC)

Rae, R. K. (York South NDP)

Ramsay, Hon. R. H., Minister of Labour (Sault Ste. Marie PC)

Reed, J. A. (Halton-Burlington L)

Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L-Lab.)

Renwick, J. A. (Riverdale NDP)

Riddell, J. K. (Huron-Middlesex L)

Robinson, A. M. (Scarborough-Ellesmere PC)

Rotenberg, D. (Wilson Heights PC)

Roy, A. J. (Ottawa East L)

Runciman, R. W. (Leeds PC)

Ruprecht, T. (Parkdale L)

Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)

Samis, G. R. (Cornwall NDP)

Sargent, E. C. (Grey-Bruce L)

Scrivener, M. (St. David PC)

Sheppard, H. N. (Northumberland PC)

Shymko, Y. R. (High Park-Swansea PC)

Snow, Hon. J. W., Minister of Transportation and Communications (Oakville PC)

Spensieri, M. A. (Yorkview L)

Stephenson, Hon. B. M., Minister of Education and Minister of Colleges and Universities (York Mills PC)

Sterling, Hon. N. W., Provincial Secretary for Justice (Carleton-Grenville PC)

Stevenson, K. R. (Durham-York PC)

Stokes, J. E. (Lake Nipigon NDP)

Swart, M. L. (Welland-Thorold NDP)

Sweeney, J. (Kitchener-Wilmot L)

Taylor, Hon. G. W., Solicitor General (Simcoe Centre PC)

Taylor, J. A. (Prince Edward-Lennox PC)

Timbrell, Hon. D. R., Minister of Agriculture and Food (Don Mills PC)

Treleven, R. L. (Oxford PC)

Turner, Hon. J. M., Speaker (Peterborough PC)

Van Horne, R. G. (London North L)

Villeneuve, O. F. (Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry PC)

Walker, Hon. G. W., Minister of Industry and Trade (London South PC)

Watson, A. N. (Chatham-Kent PC)

Welch, Hon. R. S., Minister of Energy and Deputy Premier (Brock PC)

Wells, Hon. T. L., Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Scarborough North PC)

Wildman, B. (Algoma NDP)

Williams, J. R. (Oriole PC)

Wiseman, Hon. D. J., Minister of Government Services (Lanark PC)

Worton, H. (Wellington South L)

Wrye, W. M. (Windsor-Sandwich L)

Yakubuski, P. J. (Renfrew South PC)

MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

Davis, Hon. W. G., Premier and President of the Council

Welch, Hon. R. S., Minister of Energy and Deputy Premier

Wells, Hon. T. L., Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs

Bernier, Hon. L., Minister of Northern Affairs

Snow, Hon. J. W., Minister of Transportation and Communications

Birch, Hon. M., Provincial Secretary for Social Development

Bennett, Hon. C. F., Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing

Miller, Hon. F. S., Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics

Timbrell, Hon. D. R., Minister of Agriculture and Food

Stephenson, Hon. B. M., Minister of Education and Minister of Colleges and Universities

McMurtry, Hon. R. R., Attorney General

Henderson, Hon. L. C., Provincial Secretary for Resources Development

Norton, Hon. K. C., Minister of the Environment

Drea, Hon. F., Minister of Community and Social Services

Grossman, Hon. L., Minister of Health

McCague, Hon. G., Chairman of Management Board of Cabinet and Chairman of Cabinet

Baetz, Hon. R. C., Minister of Tourism and Recreation

Wiseman, Hon. D. J., Minister of Government Services

Elgie, Hon. R. G., Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations

Walker, Hon. G. W., Minister of Industry and Trade

Gregory, Hon. M. E. C., Minister without Portfolio

Pope, Hon. A. W., Minister of Natural Resources

Leluk, Hon. N. G., Minister of Correctional Services

Ashe, Hon. G. L., Minister of Revenue

Ramsay, Hon. R. H., Minister of Labour

McCaffrey, Hon. R. B., Minister of Citizenship and Culture

Sterling, Hon. N. W., Provincial Secretary for Justice

Taylor, Hon. G. W., Solicitor General

Eaton, Hon. R. G., Minister without Portfolio

PARLIAMENTARY ASSISTANTS

Andrewes, P. W. (Lincoln), assistant to the Minister of Energy

Brandt, A. S. (Sarnia), assistant to the Minister of Labour

Dean, G. H. (Wentworth), assistant to the Minister of Education and the Minister of Colleges and Universities

Fish, S. A. (St. George), assistant to the Minister of Citizenship and Culture

Gillies, P. A. (Brantford), assistant to the Provincial Secretary for Social Development

Gordon, J. K. (Sudbury), assistant to the Minister of Health

Hennessy, M. (Fort William), assistant to the Minister of Northern Affairs

Hodgson, W. (York North), assistant to the Minister of Government Services

Jones, T. (Mississauga North), assistant to the Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics

Kennedy, R. D. (Mississauga South), assistant to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs

Lane, J. G. (Algoma-Manitoulin), assistant to the Minister of Industry and Trade

MacQuarrie, R. W. (Carleton East), assistant to the Solicitor General

McNeil, R. K. (Elgin), assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food

Mitchell, R. C. (Carleton), assistant to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations

Rotenberg, D. (Wilson Heights), assistant to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing

Stevenson, K. R. (Durham-York), assistant to the Minister of the Environment

Watson, A. N. (Chatham-Kent), assistant to the Minister of Community and Social Services

Williams, J. R. (Orillia), assistant to the Minister of Revenue

Yakabuski, P. J. (Renfrew South), assistant to the Minister of Natural Resources

STANDING COMMITTEES

Administration of justice: chairman, Mr. Eves; vice-chairman, Mr. Mitchell; members, Messrs. Brandt, Breithaupt, Elston, Ms. Fish, Messrs. Gillies, Kolyn, Renwick, Spensieri, Stevenson and Swart; clerk, D. Arnott.

General government: chairman, Mr. Harris; vice-chairman, Mr. McLean; members, Messrs. Charlton, Eakins, Gordon, Haggerty, Hennessy, J. M. Johnson, Jones, Kennedy, McKessock and Samis; clerk, F. Carrozza.

Resources development: chairman, Mr. Barlow; vice-chairman, Mr. Williams; members, Messrs. Andrewes, Dean, Lane, Laughren, Piché, J. A. Reed, Riddell, Stokes, Sweeney and Villeneuve; clerk, A. Richardson.

Social development: chairman, Mr. Robinson; vice-chairman, Mr. Kells; members, Messrs. Allen, Boudria, Ms. Copps, Messrs. R. F. Johnston, McGuigan, McNeil, Pollock, Runciman, Sheppard and Shymko; clerk, L. Mellor.

Members' services: chairman, Mr. Shymko; vice-chairman, Mr. Havrot; members, Messrs. Cassidy, Grande, Hodgson, MacQuarrie, G. I. Miller, Piché, Rotenberg, Ruprecht, Wrye and Yakabuski; clerk, L. Mellor.

Procedural affairs: chairman, Mr. Treleaven; vice-chairman, Mr. J. A. Taylor; members, Messrs. Breaugh, Charlton, Edighoffer, Epp, J. M. Johnson, Mancini, McLean, McNeil, Rotenberg and Watson; clerk, S. Forsyth.

Public accounts: chairman, Mr. T. P. Reid; vice-chairman, Mr. Kolyn; members, Messrs. Bradley, Cunningham, Harris, Havrot, Kennedy, Philip, Sargent, Mrs. Scrivener, Messrs. Wildman and Yakabuski; clerk, G. White.

Regulations and other statutory instruments: chairman, Mr. Kerr; vice-chairman, Mr. Hodgson; members, Ms. Bryden, Messrs. Cousens, Di Santo, Hennessy, Jones, Kerrio, McEwen, Runciman, Van Horne and Williams; clerk, L. Mellor.

SELECT COMMITTEE

Ombudsman: chairman, Mr. Runciman; members, Messrs. Boudria, Cooke, Eakins, Hennessy, Hodgson, Lupusella, MacQuarrie, Mitchell, Piché, Shymko and Van Horne; clerk, G. White.

*The lists in this appendix, brought up to date as necessary, are published in Hansard on the first Friday of each month and in the first and last issues of each session.

CONTENTS

Friday, May 6, 1983

Statement by the ministry

Miller, Hon. F. S., Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics:

Budgetary process.	549
-------------------------------------	-----

Oral questions

Davis, Hon. W. G., Premier:

Budget advice , Mr. Conway.	561
--	-----

Miller, Hon. F. S., Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics:

Budget changes , Mr. Peterson, Mr. Rae, Mr. T. P. Reid, Mr. Conway.	550
Budgetary process , Mr. Rae, Mr. Peterson.	553
Budget security , Mr. Conway, Mr. Renwick.	554
Budget printing contract , Mr. Cooke, Mr. Nixon.	554
Budget changes , Mr. Nixon.	555
OHIP premiums , Mr. McClellan, Mr. O'Neil.	555
Assistance to farmers , Mr. Swart.	557
Budget changes , Mr. Foulds, Mr. Wrye.	558
Budget printing contract , Mr. Philip, Mr. Ruston.	560

Taylor, Hon. G. W., Solicitor General:

Deaths at Hospital for Sick Children , Mr. Peterson, Ms. Copps.	557
--	-----

Timbrell, Hon. D. R., Minister of Agriculture and Food:

Assistance to farmers , Mr. Riddell, Mr. McGuigan, Mr. Swart.	556
Cutbacks in extension programs , Mr. G. I. Miller, Mr. Swart.	558

Walker, Hon. G. W., Minister of Industry and Trade:

Funding for ministerial programs , Mr. Mackenzie, Mr. Sweeney.	559
---	-----

Welch, Hon. R. S., Minister of Energy and Deputy Premier:

Hydro contracts , Mr. Kerrio.	560
--	-----

Other business

Budget security , Mr. Peterson, Mr. Rae, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Wells, Mr. McClellan, Mr. Conway, Mr. Renwick, Mr. Breithaupt, Mr. Mancini, Mr. Sweeney, Mr. Breaugh, Mr. Riddell, Mr. Davis, Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Van Horne, Mr. McGuigan, Mr. T. P. Reid.	533
All-Ontario Pitch-In Day , Mr. G. I. Miller.	561
Kentucky Derby , Mr. Drea.	561
Withdrawal of motion , Mr. Speaker.	562
Members' privileges , Mr. Nixon.	562
Adjournment.	562

Appendix

Alphabetical list of members of the Legislature of Ontario, members of the executive council, parliamentary assistants and members of committees.	563
---	-----

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Ashe, Hon. G. L., Minister of Revenue (Durham West PC)
Breauth, M. J. (Oshawa NDP)
Breithaupt, J. R. (Kitchener L)
Cassidy, M. (Ottawa Centre NDP)
Conway, S. G. (Renfrew North L)
Cooke, D. S. (Windsor-Riverside NDP)
Copps, S. M. (Hamilton Centre L)
Davis, Hon. W. G., Premier (Brampton PC)
Drea, Hon. F., Minister of Community and Social Services (Scarborough Centre PC)
Eaton, Hon. R. G., Minister without Portfolio (Middlesex PC)
Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP)
Gordon, J. K. (Sudbury PC)
Johnston, R. F. (Scarborough West NDP)
Kerrio, V. G. (Niagara Falls L)
Kolyn, A. (Lakeshore PC)
Mackenzie, R. W. (Hamilton East NDP)
Mancini, R. (Essex South L)
McClellan, R. A. (Bellwoods NDP)
McGuigan, J. F. (Kent-Elgin L)
Miller, Hon. F. S., Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics (Muskoka PC)
Miller, G. I. (Haldimand-Norfolk L)
Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
O'Neil, H. P. (Quinte L)
Peterson, D. R. (London Centre L)
Philip, E. T. (Etobicoke NDP)
Rae, R. K. (York South NDP)
Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L-Lab.)
Renwick, J. A. (Riverdale NDP)
Riddell, J. K. (Huron-Middlesex L)
Rotenberg, D. (Wilson Heights PC)
Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
Swart, M. L. (Welland-Thorold NDP)
Sweeney, J. (Kitchener-Wilmot L)
Taylor, Hon. G. W., Solicitor General (Simcoe Centre PC)
Timbrell, Hon. D. R., Minister of Agriculture and Food (Don Mills PC)
Turner, Hon. J. M., Speaker (Peterborough PC)
Van Horne, R. G. (London North L)
Walker, Hon. G. W., Minister of Industry and Trade (London South PC)
Welch, Hon. R. S., Minister of Energy and Deputy Premier (Brock PC)
Wells, Hon. T. L., Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Scarborough North PC)
Wiseman, Hon. D. J., Minister of Government Services (Lanark PC)
Wrye, W. M. (Windsor-Sandwich L)



Hansard

Official Report of Debates

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Third Session, 32nd Parliament
Monday, May 9, 1983

Speaker: Honourable John M. Turner
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

Contents of the proceedings reported in this issue of Hansard appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of the speakers taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is \$15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service Information Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street Toronto, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 965-2238.



LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Monday, May 9, 1983

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

QUESTIONS TO MINISTRY OF EDUCATION

Mr. Foulds: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege: I wonder if you might inquire of the Premier (Mr. Davis) whether under standing order 27(h) he has instructed the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Education (Miss Stephenson), in her continuing absence because of her health, to answer on her behalf.

Mr. Speaker: I think it is really not my responsibility to pass along questions to other members. I would suggest that perhaps the appropriate time to raise this would be when the Premier or the Deputy Premier (Mr. Welch) arrives.

COMMISSION ON ELECTION CONTRIBUTIONS AND EXPENSES

Mr. Speaker: I beg to inform the House I have today laid upon the table the eighth annual report of the Commission on Election Contributions and Expenses for the year 1982.

MEMBERS' PRIVILEGES

Mr. Speaker: At this point I wish to rule on the question of privilege that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Peterson) raised on Friday last. The question is of considerable importance and I have carefully reviewed the arguments presented by a number of honourable members as well as the cases specifically cited and the parliamentary law texts.

The privileges of the House are stated in general terms in the 19th edition of Erskine May's Parliamentary Practice at page 67 as follows:

"Parliamentary privilege is the sum of the peculiar rights enjoyed by each House collectively as a constituent part of the High Court of Parliament, and by members of each House individually, without which they could not discharge their functions, and which exceed those possessed by other bodies or individuals."

To be considered a question of privilege, a matter must pertain to a right or immunity

which the ordinary citizen does not enjoy. These special rights and immunities allow the Legislature to meet and carry out its proper constitutional role, members to discharge their responsibilities to their constituents and persons involved in the parliamentary process to carry out their duties and responsibilities without obstruction or fear of prosecution.

The principal privileges of the House or of its members are cited in the Australian parliamentary text, House of Representatives Practice, at page 645, and include the right of free speech in Parliament, the right of the House as a body to freedom of access to the Lieutenant Governor, immunity of members from arrest, detention or molestation for civil causes during defined periods, immunity of members from the obligation to serve on juries, immunity of witnesses summoned to attend before the House or one of its committees from being questioned or impeached for evidence given before the House or a committee, the power to order the arrest and imprisonment of persons guilty of contempt or breach of privilege, and the power to expel members.

The Leader of the Opposition and the member for York South (Mr. Rae), as well as a number of other members, stressed the importance of ensuring the secrecy of the provisions contained in the budget until it is presented in the House, the responsibility of the Treasurer and Minister of Economics (Mr. F. S. Miller) to take all the necessary steps to preserve the confidentiality of the budget, and the right of the House to call the minister to account for any breaches of budget secrecy.

The budget by its very nature must be kept secret until it is presented by the Treasurer in the House. Such a practice is, of course, necessary to prevent financial speculation and the loss of revenue to the government treasury. These reasons were enumerated by honourable members on Friday last. However, I have been unable to find any precedent which states that the matter of budget secrecy is one which may be treated as a question of privilege. The Leader of the Opposition made reference to two cases in the United Kingdom concerning budget disclosure. In neither of these cases was the

matter treated as a breach of the privileges of the House, nor were the cases sent to the committee on privileges for inquiry.

The 1936 case, involving Mr. J. H. Thomas, concerned a disclosure by Mr. Thomas, of certain budget secrets, when he was colonial secretary. The matter was investigated by an extra-parliamentary tribunal of inquiry and the secretary was found to have, without authority, disclosed contents of the budget. Mr. Thomas resigned on his own initiative from the government and from the House. The 1947 case, involving Hugh Dalton, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, concerned the disclosure to a reporter of budget information. The matter was raised by way of a notice of motion standing in the name of several private members. The motion called for the appointment of a select committee to inquire into the circumstances of disclosure. Mr. Dalton resigned on his own initiative the position of Chancellor of the Exchequer before the select committee was struck to consider the matter.

Budget secrecy is a political convention, as is the practice that the Treasurer presents his budget in the House before discussing it in any other public forum. It has nothing to do with parliamentary privilege. My decision is supported by the decisions of a number of Speakers in several jurisdictions, including Speaker Sauvé on November 18, 1981, and most recently on April 19, 1983, and Speaker Smith of the Legislative Assembly of British Columbia on April 1, 1976.

I would also direct the attention of honourable members to the comments of Joseph Maingot in his text, *Parliamentary Privilege in Canada*, where he states: "Parliamentary privilege is concerned with the special rights of members, not in their capacity as ministers or as party leaders, whips or parliamentary secretaries, but strictly in their capacity as members in their parliamentary work. Therefore, allegations of misjudgement, or mismanagement, or maladministration on the part of the minister in the performance of his ministerial duties do not come within the purview of parliamentary privilege. And neither does an allegation that a minister permitted a budget leak constitute a matter of privilege."

In finding that a *prima facie* case of privilege does not exist in this case, I am making a procedural decision the effect of which will not prevent the further discussion by the House of the matter. The effect is to refuse precedence to this matter as a question of privilege but not to

prevent the presentation of this matter under different circumstances on another occasion.

2:10 p.m.

The disclosure of information relating to the budget has to do with the conduct of a minister of the crown in the performance of his ministerial duties. Allegations that the Treasurer failed to ensure the secrecy of the budget and thereby permitted a budget leak may only be raised by a substantive motion of want of confidence in, or censure of, the minister. The purpose of such a motion is to question or bring to account a minister's responsibility to the House.

In support of such procedure for making direct accusations against the holders of certain offices, including ministers, Speaker Michener stated on June 19, 1959, "Simple justice requires that no honourable member should have to submit to investigation of his conduct by the House or a committee until he has been charged with an offence." Such a charge is raised by way of a substantive motion.

Finally, the member for Renfrew North (Mr. Conway), joined by the member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick) and the member for Essex South (Mr. Mancini), claimed it was a breach of parliamentary privilege for the minister to have spoken to the press about the alleged disclosure of information relating to the budget before making a statement first to the House. As I stated in my ruling of February 1, 1983, "Although it is a courtesy to the assembly for a minister to release information in the assembly before releasing it to the press or to the public, it is not a breach of the privileges or rules of the assembly if this does not happen."

VISITORS

Mr. Speaker: I would like to call the attention of all honourable members to the presence in the Speaker's gallery of a delegation of Boy Scouts representing the 75th anniversary of scouting. These boys have spent the day at Queen's Park and will, on behalf of the Boy Scouts Provincial Council of Ontario, present a plaque that will be displayed in this building.

I am certain all members join with me in welcoming our guests and in recognizing the outstanding contribution made by Boy Scouts over these past 75 years.

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY

KENTUCKY DERBY

Mr. T. P. Reid: We won.

Mr. Breithaupt: What looks good in the fifth?

Hon. Mr. Drea: He won. If the members had listened to me—

Mr. T. P. Reid: You have to be good at something, Frank.

Hon. Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, before coming to the statement that was supposed to be delivered on Friday but unfortunately could not be because of other events in this House, it is my distinct honour this afternoon to convey the official congratulations of the government of Ontario and the people of Ontario to Sunny's Halo for that most distinguished and most magnificent mile and a quarter on Saturday afternoon.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Drea: I think the particular win by this most distinguished and most courageous horse should be put into the economic perspective of this province. First of all, it was a very distinctive win by virtue of the fact that Sunny's Halo, like so many great products of Ontario, has had to overcome great adversity in order to triumph. It is a matter of record that last year that horse was running on a wrenched ankle and bucked shins. Very few horses ever come back from there.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Just like this government.

Hon. Mr. Davis: And just like Sunny's Halo, we will win again.

Mr. T. P. Reid: He won by a nose. You might win by another part of the anatomy.

Hon. Mr. Drea: The racing and the breeding industry in this province is a very significant part of agriculture. I think it should be brought to the attention of the House that in the last three years the racing stars of this province have brought the breeding and racing industry of Ontario into worldwide prominence. First, there was Glorious Song, an Eclipse winner, probably the greatest mare who has run in our time. Second, there was Deputy Minister last year, who unfortunately because of an accident has never reached his full potential, and now we have Sunny's Halo.

This will mean, in the fall, vastly increased sales and export dollars, because never before has the sire of this particular horse had an outstanding colt. It will mean new farms started up. It will mean better wages for a large number of people who depend on the racing industry and, indeed, for those who would risk not only their time but also their personal funds, as Mr. Foster has. He bred that horse, he stayed with

that horse, he maintained that horse and he is fully entitled now to recognize the fruition of a particular dream as well as the great honour and distinction he has brought to this province.

It is also a matter of record that it has been one of the outstanding accomplishments of this government that we have invested for so many years in the breeding and racing industry of this province. Indeed, without government support, government initiative and government backing it is a well-known fact that the industry would not be in the position where we now stand in the forefront of the world.

Once again, I speak on behalf of all the people of this province who were thrilled, in the greatest individual sports spectacle of the year, to see an Ontario horse come well ahead, winning against all the odds and showing what not only Canadian initiative but Ontario talent can produce.

DAY NURSERIES ACT REVISIONS

Hon. Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, if I may come to the statement that was to be delivered on Friday last, I would like to advise the House of revised standards for the Day Nurseries Act of Ontario which will become effective January 1, 1984.

These standards are based on a consultation paper prepared by my ministry following a review of current literature on child development and preliminary consultation with authorities in the day nurseries field.

The paper was distributed province-wide in February 1980 to more than 5,000 child care experts and workers, parents and other groups and individuals interested in day nursery services. Staff from my ministry discussed the proposals contained in the consultation paper with more than 1,000 individuals at meetings in various communities across Ontario and we reviewed 101 written submissions on these proposals.

Most of the changes simply clarify the intent of existing regulations, some of which are imprecise and open to misinterpretation. Other changes bring the program into line with current knowledge of child development and existing practices in most of the province's day nurseries. Overall we believe we have streamlined and simplified the regulations. At the same time we have improved the quality of care for children in day nurseries and in supervised family day care.

Although the new standards will become effective January 1, 1984, existing operators of day nurseries will have until the date of their

annual licence renewal next year to comply with them.

The following are the highlights:

Beginning next year, all agencies supervising private home day care must be licensed. There are now 5,000 spaces in these family day care settings in Ontario, of which 4,000 are subsidized by my ministry. These agencies employ home visitors to assess family homes for day care and to provide training and support to the care givers. The new regulations stipulate that the maximum number of homes that each of these staff members can supervise is 25.

This supervised family day care is the fastest-growing area of child care today and will no doubt be the largest area of expansion in the future.

2:20 p.m.

As far as day nurseries are concerned, the new regulations will require at least one of the program staff members working with each group of children in a day nursery to have a diploma in early childhood education or the equivalent. The staff in most urban day care centres already have these qualifications. Staff working at centres where they are not met will be given time to upgrade themselves.

A group of children in a day nursery may be comprised of 10 infants, 15 toddlers, 16 preschoolers, 25 five-year-olds or 30 school age children. Only one group of children will be allowed in a room at one time except in the case of preschoolers where up to 24 children aged 30 months to five years will be permitted.

The toddler category, which now includes children from 18 months to 24 months of age, will be expanded to include children up to 30 months of age. This is in keeping with the results of widely accepted research which show that children need intensive adult support during this period to build good language skills as a foundation for learning.

Recent studies have found that both staff-child ratios and group size affect the quality of day care for children under the age of three years. The current staff-to-child ratio for children in the toddler category in Ontario day nurseries is one care giver for every five children. It will remain the same for the extended toddler group, allowing children to benefit from a higher staffing ratio for six more months.

With respect to the other age groups in day nurseries, our revised regulations will set the minimum staff-to-child ratio for children in the preschool category—30 months to five years—at one to eight. It now ranges from one to five in

small day care centres to one to nine in large centres. In keeping with current practices, the ratio for five-year-olds will be set at one to 12, and the ratio for children aged six to nine will be set at one to 15.

As I have just indicated, the ratio for toddlers—age 18 months to 30 months of age—will be one to five. There will be no change in the staff-to-child ratio for infants up to 18 months of age. It will remain at one to three.

The revisions to the staffing ratios will create a uniform high-quality minimum standard for all centres. By allowing for the redistribution of staff, they will also provide more support for the age groups that need it. The changes are not expected to increase costs substantially and, in fact, the additional cost to my ministry for all of Ontario will be only \$60,000 a year. Day care centres with fewer than 45 children will require no increase in staff, and most of the larger centres already employ more staff than required by the existing regulations.

As of December 31, 1982, there were 81,768 children enrolled in 1,877 licensed day nurseries in Ontario. Our annual budget for child care subsidies for parents who qualify is \$80 million. In addition to our regular expenditure on day care, the Ministry of Community and Social Services is also providing funds for special child care programs in Ontario. In co-operation with nine municipalities across the province, we have launched a series of employment support initiatives.

For the duration of these pilot projects we will subsidize the cost of child care for more than 3,000 children of sole-support parents on social assistance who are looking for jobs or are in retraining programs. Those parents will be able to choose from a comprehensive range of child care services the form of care most suited to their needs and the needs of their children. Depending on the type of care they choose, my ministry will pay between 80 and 100 per cent of the cost.

These programs are under way in Peterborough, Metropolitan Toronto, Thunder Bay, Ottawa, Waterloo, Windsor, Peel region and the counties of Dufferin and Lanark. The employment support initiatives projects will also provide pre-employment counselling and cover the cost of other employment related expenses such as transportation for sole-support parents.

I will be giving the House an update on the entire general welfare assistance-Family Benefits Act integration program and the employ-

ment support initiatives projects in the near future. Both the revisions to the day nurseries standards and the additional child care subsidies we are offering parents on social assistance underline the special responsibility this government has accepted for children and our commitment to provide them with the finest services available.

BUDGET

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, as I told the House on Friday, the decision we decided to make about the printing of my budget could disrupt our original timetable. I am now pleased to report that a great deal of work over the weekend has put us back on schedule and I intend to present my budget to the House tomorrow afternoon. I plan to begin the presentation after all the Canadian stock exchanges have closed, or at approximately 4:30 p.m. Toronto time.

We were able to return to our schedule and begin printing early today through the extraordinary efforts of a great many public servants who have been involved in this project. I have already told the members of my staff in the Ministry of Treasury and Economics how grateful I am for their loyalty and for their dedication and of my admiration for their skills and commitment.

I would also like publicly to express our appreciation to the staff of the translation bureau and the printing services branch of the Ministry of Government Services for the efforts which they are making in very abnormal circumstances. I have spoken to their minister about this and I have asked him to pass on to them my thanks and admiration.

Finally, sir, I must use this opportunity to thank my colleagues in this House, my friends in Muskoka and the hundreds of others throughout Ontario for the support and the understanding they have shown to me in so many ways over the past four or five days. I am very grateful to them.

ORAL QUESTIONS

BUDGETARY PROCESS

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Treasurer. Given the recent events, given the events that I am sure the Treasurer will recall with respect to the passing of his last budget a year or so ago when he was called to a committee to explain that budget after the fact, given some of the very serious difficulties Mr.

MacEachen had in presenting his budget, which did not conform with some of the realities of the world at that time, and the problems Mr. Lalonde has had recently and about which the Treasurer has commented, and given the fact that, as I am sure he and his Premier (Mr. Davis) have admitted, it is probably the single most important document this Legislature deals with in the course of a year, and mindful of the words of Gladstone when he said budgets are not merely affairs of arithmetic but in thousands of ways go to the root of prosperity of individuals, the relations of classes and the strengths of kingdoms, will the Treasurer not agree with me now that the time has come for a very serious review of the way in which we draft and prepare our budget?

Will the Treasurer not agree that his government should be thinking of ways to update the budgetary process and bring it into the 20th century?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, the suggestion my friend makes cannot be taken as if the budget were standing free and alone within the system of government we function in. One would have to look at the entire system of government. Should a party with a majority form the government? We believe it should. If that is sustained, should that party retain the responsibility for bringing in budgets which are generally acceptable to the public and upon which that government is judged at voting time? We believe it should.

I do not believe the Leader of the Opposition can get to the point he is going to try to get to: i.e., letting his party share in all the benefits of writing a budget whilst accepting none of the responsibility for being on this side of the House.

Mr. Peterson: With great respect, that is not my point. It is not the point of the Canadian Tax Foundation or anyone else who has looked at this very serious issue. Certainly one of the things the Treasurer could do would be to present his taxing options to a standing committee of this House, for example. Ultimately the final selection would be the prerogative of the Treasurer, shrouded in secrecy at that particular time, but at least it would open up this process and avoid, with great respect, some of the difficulties he had in the last budget and that Mr. MacEachen had in his two budgets.

Does the Treasurer not think, given the topicality of this situation at the present time and some of the difficulties that have arisen, that this entire matter of budget reform—and if

he wants to include reform of the entire Legislature, that is his prerogative—should be referred at least to the standing committee on procedural affairs of this House so we can develop budgets that will better serve the people of this province? Surely that is a reasonable request.

2:30 p.m.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I believe the people have been well served by the system we have in this province, in this country and, in fact, in all those nations that use the parliamentary system of government. I believe the system works very well.

There are times when Treasurers or finance ministers go the route he discusses with good cause. For example, last year I asked the Ontario Economic Council to study whether or not Ontario should stay within the federal-provincial income tax collection agreement. I also put a paper out on the Ontario health insurance plan. Those are for structural changes in the tax system. We do listen when structural change is occurring; we do talk a lot.

On the other hand, one of my options in any budget period is the imposition of three or four per cent more sales tax on a particular item, such as an automobile; or the removal of sales tax from an automobile. If I were to suggest that to him, what would he think that does to a market while we are making up our mind in some committee? If he thinks it does not have a dramatic, immediate effect upon buyers' points of view he is wrong.

Mr. Cooke: Mr. Speaker, I think there is at least one part of the system that could be changed. When the budget is tabled in the Legislature, rather than having to go through the silly process we went through last year of getting the Treasurer to refer one bill to committee, does he not think it would make sense to have a committee of this Legislature examine that budget in detail?

Whether it is called the budget committee or the finance committee, it would be a group to which we could have the budget referred in total, where expert witnesses could be called and we would have the participation of members of this Legislature. Does he not think that would be better than going through what is rather an insular process now, where he could have the experts come in and talk to him? Now he presents the budget and that is the end of it; there is very little opportunity for other members of the Legislature to really benefit and

learn from the system, or to participate in debating it.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, the same tack is being taken by the member for Windsor-Riverside; that is, that somehow the philosophy of the budget should be up for grabs in a committee. I do not say that is not right in some forms of government or in some types of organization of government; I simply say that in our form of government one cannot change one part of the jigsaw puzzle without looking at all the other responsibilities.

What we do, as he knows, is we refer bills specifically for reviewing the wording of the bills. That is really all that is there unless one wishes to defeat it. In a majority government such as we have the chance of that defeat is not likely; therefore, we generally concentrate our attempts to discuss a bill on the phraseology. I have no problem, as he knows, with better wording of a bill. That is properly the function of both the opposition and our side. He knows the principles of this government require us to stand or fall upon the policy of the bill.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I have always had great admiration for the Treasurer and the fact that he is one of the few who are willing to accept individual responsibility for their actions. But does he not believe something worthwhile came out of the process last year when the retail sales tax bill went to the committee and members of the public, along with members of this House, were able to present their concerns to the Treasurer?

He rightly said: "It is my responsibility and I will stand or hang with it." But he had that opportunity to hear what impact his budgetary measures were actually having on the people of the province. He also had the chance to change those instances which may have adversely affected a lot of people, which the Treasurer and his experts were not aware of. Surely the time spent in that kind of process is well worth while, both for a good budget we all want to see and for the impact it is going to have on the people of the province and the accountability we all owe them.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, my understanding was that it was referred to the committee under the rules of the House and was the choice of the opposition parties under those same rules. They make a decision each time as to whether they want a bill debated in that forum. They have that power, as I understand it. I am not an expert on House rules, but I do not

recall being the one who volunteered that measure.

TRUST COMPANIES

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations concerning the trust companies affair.

In a letter from Mr. Jack Biddell to the minister, dated February 28, 1983, which became public last week, Mr. Biddell wrote: "I came to the conclusion that in this affair we were probably witnessing a 'scam' which, even though it might not prove to be illegal, simply could not be allowed to continue and to escalate."

It is clear from the letter that there was much consultation between Mr. Biddell and the minister. Can the minister indicate, either according to Mr. Biddell or from his own knowledge, how long this apparent scam had been going on within these companies?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, if I may clarify the availability of the Biddell letter, the letter was voluntarily tabled by a counsel last week in the courts and subsequently was the subject of a press release by one of the parties. That clarifies how that letter became public.

The letter revealed that Mr. Biddell, acting as special adviser to the government, had reviewed the information available and had come to the firm opinion that on the one transaction alone, the Cadillac-Fairview transaction, the companies involved had seriously eroded their borrowing bases or had eliminated them completely so that they no longer had the right to take deposits.

Second, as my friend the member for Kitchener has pointed out, he indicated that although there was no positive proof of any illegal activity at that stage, it was his opinion from 40 years of working in this field that in all probability there was a scam. That is what the honourable member is talking about. He then went on to concur with the recommendation that he had put to me with respect to actions the government might take.

Mr. Biddell has been under cross-examination before a special examiner for the past four weeks on the very issues the member is talking about. The exact extent of the information that was available to him is a subject of that transcript and will be available at the appropriate time.

Mr. Breithaupt: Since Mr. Biddell indicated in his letter that the registrar of loan and trust corporations and his staff were one source of his

information, does the minister know to what extent the annual examination reports of the registrar's investigators assisted Mr. Biddell in arriving at his conclusion to advise cabinet to seize these companies on January 7?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: As I have said, Mr. Biddell has been under cross-examination for four weeks about the various information and sources that led him to the conclusions he has reached, and whatever his sources were will be information that will be available in those transcripts.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the questionable loans made by Crown Trust were made in a very short period of time shortly after the company was acquired by Mr. Rosenberg. However, it is also clear that questionable loans appear to have been made by Seaway Trust over a lengthy period of time, during which time its capital was increasing, its assets were increasing at an extraordinary rate compared to the rest of the industry and during which time the cabinet itself was mandating the increase in its borrowing base because of the approvals that were given to Seaway Trust.

Can the minister now explain how it is that this government itself could have been so unaware of the kinds of things that were going on in Seaway Trust that they actually approved officially of the kinds of activities they were getting into?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, the issue of the equity participation of Seaway Trust, for example, that the honourable member referred to is a matter we have discussed here before. Clearly, an increase in the amount of capital that individuals have in a business is to the benefit and assurance of the public. I certainly hope the member is not suggesting that this should not have been done in our endeavours to strengthen that company's equity base.

As to the role of the regulators during the course of those few months, I have indicated on many occasions in this House that there is an internal review going on and that there is a Morrison report coming out at the end of this month. I would hope the objectivity of this House would demand that all of this information be seen and put in the proper perspective. If that is not what the member wants, let him say so.

Mr. Martel: Don't be so petulant. You sound like a little boy.

Mr. Swart: Sensitive, aren't you?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

2:40 p.m.

Mr. Breithaupt: I have a final supplementary, not entirely following that last line of comment.

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

Mr. Breithaupt: Since the minister advised these series of activities on the part of the government were as a result of information and opinion Mr. Biddell gave him, can he indicate, on the basis of any conversations he has had with the registrar, what indication the registrar gave him as to how long this state of affairs had existed in the companies? I ask that because presumably, in the cross-examination of Mr. Biddell about that, that particular information may not be otherwise be available.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: I have responded to this question on other occasions and I can only repeat the answer I gave to the previous member. As the member for Kitchener is well aware, there are a number of judicial actions under way at the present time and this subject matter is part of it.

VISITOR

Mr. Speaker: Just before proceeding, I am advised we have a distinguished visitor in the gallery in the person of the Solicitor General of Canada, the Honourable Robert Kaplan. I ask you to join me in welcoming him.

BUDGET INCENTIVES

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier. It is with regard to some statements he made over the weekend concerning the provincial economy.

In discussing the contents of the budget on Saturday, the Premier said the focus of the budget would be to provide incentives for private industry to create jobs. The Premier said, "We intend to introduce policies and programs that will encourage the creation of jobs in the private sector."

I wonder if the Premier is aware that six Secretaries of Labor in the United States, serving both Democratic and Republican Presidents, have together written a letter to President Reagan saying the approach of focusing only on the private sector is inadequate and will not deal with the immediate crisis in terms of unemployment.

If I may just quote from their letter, which was in yesterday's New York Times, they said: "We agree that the private sector under ideal circumstances should generate such jobs and participate in retraining programs, but this will

take time. Until then, government has an obligation to provide relief."

I would like to ask the Premier, does he not recognize that there are hundreds of thousands of people out there who cannot wait for jobs simply to trickle down and who are looking to this government for direct job creation and direct leadership? Can he give us the assurance that he will heed the advice of these gentlemen, who are not particularly of our political persuasion in this party, and recognize that there is a crisis which government has to deal with?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am always delighted when the leader of the New Democratic Party goes south of the border to seek his economic and political advice. I only wish he would accept it on some other issues. I find it intriguing that the leader of a party totally committed to economic nationalism, cultural nationalism, no more branch plants and, "We do not like the Americans," gets up here and recites to me the view of six former Secretaries of Labor in the United States government. Here is another conversion on the road to Damascus.

I can only say to the honourable member, being as knowledgeable as he is about the differences in the economies of the United States and Canada, where we have always had some greater measure of balance in terms of the public and private sectors, that I would think he really would not seek out the opinions of our American neighbours in relation to the Ontario economy because he, his predecessor and the member for Sudbury East (Mr. Martel) have spent their total careers belabouring me as to why we should accept no economic advice or help from our American friends.

Mr. Rae: I am trying to find language and arguments the Premier will understand. When he had Phil Crane, Alexander Haig and these dinosaurs entertaining members of the Conservative Party in the city of Toronto over the last month, I thought it might be appropriate, given the abjectly colonial nature of the mentality on that side of the House to try to devise some arguments that would make some sense to them.

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

Mr. Rae: I would simply like to ask the Premier, again, a direct question. Does he really think the hundreds of thousands of unemployed people in this province can afford to wait for all the job creation measures to come trickling down from the private sector? Does he not recognize that the government of this province

has a very real obligation, a contract with the people of this province to provide jobs when the private sector is clearly not providing the jobs that need to be provided for the citizens of this province?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am delighted the member reads my speeches so carefully. I wish he had been there to listen to me on Saturday, along with the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Peterson). I gave some friendly advice on how to handle certain political issues of the day. Friday would have been a much happier day if the member had accepted that advice in advance; but that is getting into another area. I only say to the member that if he would read page 8 of my remarks—

Mr. Bradley: You would never have got away with it in Ottawa.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That is why I am here.

Mr. Speaker: Never mind the interjections, please.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I understand—

Mr. Speaker: Will the Premier please address himself to the question? Order.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I will resist the temptation to say to the member for St. Catharines (Mr. Bradley) that his lips move before his brains, but I will get back to the—

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Look on page 8.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Conway: Let's not be personal now.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I wasn't, I was just stating a fact—

Mr. Conway: We wouldn't want the Tory women to be upset, would we?

Mr. Speaker: Will the Premier please address himself to the question? And will the member for Renfrew North (Mr. Conway) please contain himself?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I gave the honourable member some advice on that matter the other day.

If the member will read the first two lines of the second paragraph on page 8, they will answer his question.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Mr. Speaker, the subtle socialist reminds me more of a punch-drunk fighter who comes out and keeps forgetting to watch the right hand of the Premier on these kinds of issues. We will not go into that, but it is

unfortunate that the leader of the New Democratic Party has put it in the context he has, because it is a real problem.

Can we be assured that in regard to those people between the ages of 16 and 24 who are facing poor prospects regardless of the Premier's optimism, there will be matters related entirely and directly to them in this budget to ensure there will not be mere words from the Premier about his optimism but programs to make sure that for the next decade at least there will be jobs created in the private or public sector?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I do not know that I can take it into the next decade—

Mr. Laughren: That's going for the jugular, you really got him there.

Mr. T. P. Reid: I didn't give him a slow curve ball.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I wonder whether I am at a baseball game or something. I will hit a lob, a curve, whatever the member throws.

Mr. Kerrio: You're a switch-hitter.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Speak for yourself.

Mr. T. P. Reid: You're still talking about baseball.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I say to the member for Rainy River (Mr. T. P. Reid) that we are perhaps talking to somewhat different issues. I expressed the view the other day, and I really believe it, that over the longer period of time for the people we categorize today as being young—in my humble opinion, anybody of 52 is young, but I know the age group the member is referring to—there will be without question job opportunities.

As a government, what we are concerned about is the shorter period of time, and I think it will be a relatively short period of time. I can only say to the member that this government does recognize the unemployment difficulties of young people, and I will not comment upon what the budget will contain tomorrow.

Mr. Rae: The truth will be found tomorrow.

Given the speed with which he has dismissed the suggestions that we in our party have made, practical suggestions with respect to job creation in social services, in the environmental sector, in the resource field, in the automobile industry and right through the entire Ontario economy, does the Premier not recognize the very special obligation the government of Ontario has with respect to the need to retrain workers

who are being affected by the destruction of jobs in many of our basic industries?

Can the Premier give us a commitment that particular measures will be taken with respect to retraining so we do not have a situation where literally thousands of people are told at age 45, 50 or 55 that they are out the door, that there is nothing there for them and there is nothing anybody can do? Does the Premier not recognize that the government and the public sector have a special obligation to those people?

2:50 p.m.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Now that the discussion has reached this level and we are not quoting experts from south of the border, I think the leader of the New Democratic Party and I might come somewhat closer in terms of our point of view. If he is asking me whether, in my view, retraining amongst various age groups in this province is part of any long-term economic strategy, the answer to that, simply, is "yes."

If he is asking me whether I agree with some of the rather grandiose proposals in the document that two of his colleagues tabled, particularly one relative to the auto industry where part of the solution is to create a crown corporation to get into the auto field, it is not just a matter of theology or philosophy with me: I do not feel any useful purpose will be served in terms of employment opportunities by creating "an Ontario automobile company," by whatever name.

I know it has particular attraction to the member's party but, with respect, I do not see that as a solution. I think the member should sit down and talk quietly to Mr. White and some others, and I know this may provoke them to say publicly, "Yes, it's a great idea," but the fellows I know in the auto business really are not excited about having yet another company, a crown corporation, involved in the production of automobiles.

MASSEY-FERGUSON

Mr. Rae: The Premier will change his tune soon when the task force report comes down.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister of Industry and Trade. As one of the trustees for the people of Ontario at Massey-Ferguson, since we now are holders of preferred shares, how does he feel about the fact that the chairman and chief executive officer of Massey-Ferguson received in 1982 an increase in salary of about \$160,000, from \$395,000 to \$554,000, in exactly the same year that Massey was losing \$510 million on sales of \$2.54 billion?

Hon. Mr. Walker: Mr. Speaker, that is something the Massey-Ferguson people have to resolve themselves. The corporation has a number of shareholders, and the shareholders have to pass judgement on it as indeed do the board of directors. All I note is a company that was in pretty bad shape just a few years ago seems to be suggesting that this year it might be reaching a break-even point. That is a rather interesting comment. There will have been a rather impressive turnaround in that period of time if that comes about.

I do not think some of the people in Brantford feel quite as disappointed as the honourable member might in terms of the success they seem to be having. Perhaps the member should be congratulating them on the success they are achieving, rather than being somewhat derogatory about some of the other aspects of their operation.

Mr. Rae: So much for the restraint program and so much for a single standard of social justice in Ontario. I am asking the minister directly, as somebody who represents the shareholders in Massey-Ferguson on behalf of the people of Ontario, how he feels about the fact that this is an increase of 40 per cent in compensation in one year, taking this gentleman to well over half a million dollars a year. Does the minister really think that kind of compensation is appropriate when thousands of workers at Massey-Ferguson are losing their jobs, let alone being asked to take a cut in pay?

Hon. Mr. Walker: As a participant, along with the federal government, and as a shareholder of the operation by a law passed by this Legislature and voted on by members of the member's party and those of the Liberal Party, I can tell him the fact that the shares have doubled in the last few weeks is rather impressive from one point of view: the kind of management of this world-wide operation that has substantial employment in Ontario. I keep saying the member should be somewhat more impressed by what they are accomplishing, rather than going around spreading dirt all over the top of them.

Mr. Sweeney: Mr. Speaker, as a shareholder, and given that we have what other members of the minister's party have sometimes referred to as a "window on the industry," exactly what kind of influence can the minister exert on this company on behalf of the government shares, or does he?

Hon. Mr. Walker: Mr. Speaker, we have the rights and obligations of preferred shareholders, which we are.

Mr. Rae: I am sure that puts fear in the hearts of all those who are operating this company.

I would like to ask the minister, as a matter of policy, instead of our having to go to the United States for this kind of information with respect to compensation of executive officers in companies operating in Ontario, is he prepared to change our securities and companies laws to require full publication of information with respect to corporate compensation in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Walker: Those acts do not fall within this ministry.

ONTARIO VETERINARY COLLEGE

Mr. Worton: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Timbrell), I would like to ask a question of the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development.

The provincial secretary is aware of the announcement on the weekend that the Ontario Veterinary College has had its accreditation reduced by the American Veterinary Medical Association because of a lack of proper facilities and well-trained instructors. The minister will realize this reduction in accreditation means the college has been put on probation and risks losing its accreditation entirely if it cannot improve its facilities.

This matter has been the subject of discussions and questions asked by the Agriculture and Food critic of the Liberal Party, and back in 1981 the minister assured this House that we would have the best veterinary college in North America and that he planned to keep it that way. In view of those statements, and in the light of what is happening now, what can he tell us?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Mr. Speaker, let me first clarify that I was not aware of the item in the paper until about half an hour before I entered the House.

Let me take the honourable member back over the period of years. The Minister of Colleges and Universities (Miss Stephenson) has met with the Minister of Agriculture and Food on several occasions to keep the type of credibility we have at the University of Guelph for veterinarians.

As I understand the statement that was made over the weekend, we have no problems for the next five years; we will keep our credibility and we will keep our accreditation. During that period, the Minister of Colleges and Universities

and the Minister of Agriculture and Food will be working towards bringing that university and the veterinary school up to a standard that is equal to any place in the world.

Mr. J. A. Reed: That is nonsense.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Worton: In the light of that statement, there seems to be a difference of opinion. I have not read the Toronto news, but from what I have read in the local paper there seems to be a difference of opinion from what the minister says.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Worton: The minister is aware that the veterinary college in Saskatoon has full accreditation and is in the process of expansion, and that the Ontario Veterinary College still needs another \$2 million in operating funds and \$9 million as the province's share of the cost of the expansion of the clinic facilities.

I think we can all agree that it has come to a sorry pass when we have a university with such a historic background as that of the OVC and the Ontario Agricultural College and we are putting it in jeopardy. I think we have to get serious about this and do something. Does the minister not agree?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: I recognize the concern of the member. Let me take it a step or two farther.

On Thursday of last week I met the president of the University of Guelph on the east steps here. He is Dr. Forster, as the members know very well.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: I was also at the funeral of the late William Amos, the clerk of McGillivray township, earlier last Thursday. The head of the veterinary college was one of my colleagues as an honorary pallbearer on that occasion. Again we had an opportunity to speak about this. Let me just assure the honourable member on behalf of this government that that college will be operating over the next five years under its president and that five years from now it will be one of the best veterinary colleges again in North America.

3 p.m.

Mr. Swart: Mr. Speaker, surely the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development must feel it is a sad day in this province when the former agricultural college at Guelph, one that has

been known throughout the world, is being reduced to its present status. Would he not think this has come about because of the small amount of its budget that his government puts into agriculture?

Specifically, now that this has come to light, has he made any representation to the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) so that the government will not reduce the amount being put into agriculture this year by another 13 per cent?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Mr. Speaker, ordinarily this honourable member does his research and follows through on most of the questions he asks, but it is a sad day when a member who carries this status blames the Minister of Agriculture and Food and does not understand that this university is funded strictly by the ministries of Education and Colleges and Universities. The Minister of Agriculture and Food is there only in an advisory capacity.

STELCO EMISSIONS

Mr. Mackenzie: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Labour. Is the minister aware there is a serious dispute over who is covered at Stelco under the new coke oven emission standards? Is he also aware that some 40 workers in the coal-handling and the byproducts plant—in the coal-handling plant in some cases the bunkers are right over the coke ovens, and in the byproducts plant only 50 to 60 feet away from the ovens—have been excluded from the regulations because of the ambiguous nature of subsection 3(1) of the regulations?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am aware.

Mr. Mackenzie: Can the minister tell us why, on April 21, Ian Carruthers and Vern Tidey of the industrial and occupational health branches supported the company, interpreting the regulations in the company's favour, which is certainly totally opposed to the way we interpret the lead regulations, where everybody exposed to them in the plant is covered? Is he prepared to take another look at the situation?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: I do not think it is a case of looking into it for the first time. The ministry has been actively engaged in seeking a resolution, and I am sure there will be one in the very near term.

ROLE OF CIVIL SERVANT

Mr. Epp: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing. The minister will recall that I wrote to him on

April 21 expressing my objections to the alleged impropriety on the part of Milton Farrow, the assistant deputy minister of community planning, and Allan Masson, the chief hearing officer of the Niagara Escarpment Development Control Hearing Office.

The behaviour in question relates to the development of Mariner's Cove in the town of Oakville. The assistant deputy minister's brother, George Farrow, had previously been denied permission to build 14 town houses in Mariner's Cove. However, town council reversed its decision last month after interference on the part of ministry staff.

Has the minister started to investigate the events surrounding the approval of George Farrow's development? If so, what progress has he made? If not, why not; and when does he intend to do so?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, first may I say to the honourable member that it has not been my practice to answer to press releases, and that is exactly how I interpret what the member sent out to the press. It was an open letter to the minister. It is not my practice, nor do I intend to make it my practice.

I want to refer to the situation in specific terms, and I want to make it very clear that Mr. Farrow happens to be an assistant deputy minister who is of outstanding quality. There is not a member in this House—whether it be you, Mr. Speaker, members on the opposite side of the House or members on this side of the House—who has not approached Mr. Farrow in a very personal way to seek his advice and guidance to help out his constituents.

Although one of the constituents in Oakville happens to be Mr. Farrow's brother, I would think he has the same privilege of asking that brother for some advice as to how he processes an application through the mill. The final analysis—let us put it very clearly—is the decision of a municipal council to take the vote and stand on it one way or the other in relationship to whatever the application might refer to.

Indeed, I recognize that Mr. Farrow's brother had submitted an application a year or so ago that had not won the approval of the council. He resubmitted his application, which is not out of the ordinary in this province; there are many who resubmit applications under different terminology to seek further advice and approval if they can get it from the council. He did so, and the council in this particular case supported his application. I see no reason to review the situation any further.

Mr. Epp: Need I remind the minister that George Farrow's comment to Oakville council on April 18 was, and I quote—and this is on tape so there is no question about it: "You know who my brother is. He is not the one who answered the letter but he can sure make it move when we want an answer." That was George Farrow's comment to Oakville council.

George Farrow also quoted statements made by one of his brother's subordinates, namely the manager of the ministry's community planning review branch, John Livey. According to the developer, Livey stated that the project was consistent with Oakville's official plan and spoke favourably of his boss's brother's development proposal.

As for Mr. Masson, it is completely inappropriate for any hearing officer, whether associated with the Ontario Municipal Board, the Niagara Escarpment Development Control Board or the land titles branch of the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations, to appear before a town council in an unofficial capacity to help the assistant deputy minister's brother get his development proposal approved.

Does the minister condone this sort of behaviour; and what message is conveyed to other senior officials, given the minister's refusal to clear the air with respect to this suggestion of a flagrant abuse of power? Finally, if the minister is not prepared to deal with the improper actions of his staff, will he at least take the appropriate steps to prevent the damage to Mariner's Cove that their interference is about to cause?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: First let us review exactly what did take place. The member wants to say what Mr. Farrow's brother replied in the Oakville council, which is correct; but one should ask oneself, what was the question which was asked. The question was asked by the councillor who opposed the plan as to who Mr. Farrow might know in the ministry.

Everyone in that council was very well aware that Mr. Farrow was the brother of an assistant deputy minister in the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing in the province. So he repeated very clearly and distinctly that his brother was Milt Farrow, which all in that council happened to know. That is what is on the record.

One should take into account what the question happened to be before the response. I have looked at the situation and had some discussions with people in my ministry relating to it. Mr. Farrow did seek some advice and guidance

from the ministry, as any other taxpayer would be entitled to do so. The assistant deputy minister Mr. Farrow did not himself get into the discussion with his brother, but did refer him to others within the ministry who could give him the advice or guidance that he would seek, to which any other taxpayer in this province would be entitled. I see nothing out of line in relationship to this action.

Mr. Breagh: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister a simple question. Does he not think it is wrong for a developer to appear before a council and clearly to imply that he knows people in places of power who will expedite this project? Is that not wrong, morally and otherwise? What has the minister done to correct the situation?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, in direct answer to that question, I suppose if the member who asked the question happened to have a brother, and he was making an application, would he deny that he was his brother? Would he deny it? That is the very situation that we are confronted with. Indeed, I would hope he would not deny his brother.

Both are very fine individuals in this province and serve their community extremely well. Mr. Farrow in the ministry has—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Would the minister please address the person who asked the question?
3:10 p.m.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: I hope we are not in a situation here of trying to reduce in any way the effectiveness of one Mr. Milt Farrow to this government and the people of this province. I believe the actions that were taken were appropriate. When the gentleman was asked who he happened to know in the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, he answered straightforwardly and clearly that his brother Milton Farrow happened to be an assistant deputy minister.

I see nothing wrong with that. Indeed, I would not expect the architect, Mr. Farrow, to deny that his brother works for the ministry. He is proud of what his brother has been able to do in this province, and indeed we should be happy for his service to this government.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. Cooke: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Treasurer. He will be aware the unemployment statistics announced Friday showed Ontario, contrary to the nationwide trend, had an

increase in unemployment from 519,000 people to 532,000, or 11.7 per cent. He will also be aware the statistics on closures and layoffs in the province show a dramatic increase for January and February, an increase of 31 per cent over all.

Is the Treasurer now prepared to admit the recovery he so often talks about is not a real recovery? It is not a recovery that will see the people of Ontario going back to work. Is he now willing to accept that the public sector has a major role to play in order to create jobs in this province?

Whether it be through municipal capital works, through the construction of nonprofit nursing homes, through the forestry sector or in housing, will he not admit the public sector has a major role to play to create those jobs? This would be in the short run, but at the same time does it not have a role to play in constructing things that will be of long-lasting benefit to all the people of Ontario?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I guess Friday morning I was not spending as much time looking at the unemployment and employment figures as I normally would have when they came out. I have them in front of me. The actual figures in Ontario in that month showed an increase in employment of 13,000 jobs and a decrease in unemployment of 18,000. The member will go down to the seasonally adjusted base, I am sure, because they suit him better. The fact remains that 13,000 more people were at work and 18,000 fewer people actually were not employed at that point.

When it comes to the question of how one creates jobs, I will never bridge the gap that exists between my colleague and me. However, unlike him I do not feel there is only one way to solve the problem. I hope when he sees my budget tomorrow he will be satisfied we have taken the multi-pronged approach to a problem.

Mr. Mackenzie: Mr. Speaker, will the Treasurer take a look at the actions of some of the plants in the Hamilton area that have shut down? They are one of the reasons for the increase in permanent closures between February 1982 and February 1983 and there has been, to say the least, less than good corporate responsibility—whether it was Flavorite Poultry or Consolidated-Bathurst or Allen Industries. At least would he take a look at some justification procedures before closures take place in Ontario that do affect large numbers of workers?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I am not going to get into

the issue of corporate responsibility again. That is a matter that one may evidence some bias about from time to time. The lists I get that show me the number of recalls, which the honourable member tends to forget about, show a net improvement. He only wants to talk about the negatives in life. I suggest to him that on balance the recovery we have been talking about is under way. If he is really interested in the people he purports to serve, he should evidence some of that confidence on their behalf too.

Mr. Wrye: Mr. Speaker, I will accept the Treasurer's argument for the moment that there may have been some mild numerical improvement, very modest none the less. He will know the areas that are resisting that movement are those that have been hit with structural unemployment. In some cities, such as my own and places such as Chatham and Sudbury, this is now into the third year and beyond. Can the Treasurer give us a commitment that his budget tomorrow will contain measures that will not only help alleviate unemployment across the province in general but will, for the first time, have this government targeting specifically toward those communities with long-term unemployment?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, again, the member will have to wait until tomorrow. He knows the Premier (Mr. Davis) has been quoted in the newspapers as saying there are measures in the budget to stimulate employment. I am reasonably sure if I showed them all to the member at this point, if I described them all carefully and patiently to him, he would still tell me they were not good enough or soon enough or effective enough.

UNEMPLOYMENT IN TOURISM INDUSTRY

Mr. Eakins: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Treasurer. Given that the revenues of our provincial tourism sector for the latest fiscal year are much lower than his expectations, and given the importance of this sector in terms of employment—541,000 Ontarians and provincial tax dollars totalling more than \$1 billion—is it fair to ask the Treasurer at this time if he has given consideration to some of the recommendations presented to him by groups, such as Tourism Ontario, in their attempt to improve the state of our tourism industry? They recommend methods such as the adjustment of provincial sales tax on prepared meals, accommodation and beverage alcohol in licensed establishments to a straight five per cent.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, the member knows I cannot answer that question. Of course I give careful consideration each year. I might suggest that particular industry thinks this Treasurer has been its supporter.

Mr. Eakins: How about the restaurants?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Their business is up 20 per cent in a year.

It so happens that when he talks about the catastrophic year I do not know if it was. Was Haliburton in trouble last year? Was the tourist business worse than in the previous year? Muskoka was not; Muskoka had the best summer season it ever had.

Mr. Kerrio: Mr. Speaker, would the minister not consider the problem of most jurisdictions that are close to the border, of having those people who visit us stay here? I wonder if the minister would take it under advisement to encourage people to stay, by talking to people such as some we have in Niagara who do as much advertising as, sometimes more than, the ministry itself?

Could the minister not do something that would help the balance of trade, because a good deal of that money certainly helps that balance? Is he going to do something that would encourage those people who come to stay when they visit us?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I guess my attitude is that that is the part that interests me most. The member is right on the border. They can get over to his city and back in minutes. Perhaps the fact is that the member sends them back, I do not know. It seems to me when they get to Muskoka, they stay.

Mr. Kerrio: They can't get away.

Hon. F. S. Miller: That is right. They usually do not have enough money to get home.

Besides that fact, they do have very localized American problems. He is close to one of the American cities that has also suffered heavily from unemployment.

After 23 or 24 years in the summer tourist business, we see a great difference in the advance bookings from the United States from year to year, depending upon the overall level of employment, particularly from the Buffalo area, which is still close to our best area for central Ontario. I am told that has been a weak area this year, that the bookings from Buffalo are down this year for the coming season. I can also tell the member, my colleagues in the business in Muskoka report bookings from other parts of Canada are up. I hope that is true.

FOREIGN STUDENT FEES

Mr. Allen: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Colleges and Universities. May I take the opportunity to welcome her back to the House. We all trust she is well recovered and ready for battle in her usual style. The questions have been piling up in her absence.

Mr. Minister—

Hon. Miss Stephenson: That's not the way to start.

Interjections.

Mr. Allen: I will not make any remarks on that slip.

The minister is aware of the growing uneasiness in Ontario universities among students, professors and administrators, on the subject of visa student fees. Given the extent to which Canadian, and Ontario universities in particular, have been enriched by university systems overseas in the past, and given that two recent studies, one British and one Canadian, on the effects of differential visa student fees have concluded there is no overall benefit in their application and much that is adverse, will the minister commit her ministry to a complete review of provincial policy towards foreign student fees, it is hoped with a view to their complete abolition?

3:20 p.m.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, first, I would like to thank the members of the House. It is nice to know I was missed. I did not believe I was except by my favourite combatants, the members for St. Catharines (Mr. Bradley) and Oakwood (Mr. Grande).

None the less, I am delighted to be able to respond to the question of the member for Hamilton West and to state clearly that the matter of the differential visa student fee for graduate students has been under review for the past several months. We are awaiting further input from the Ontario Graduate Association, input which was promised us several months ago but has not yet arrived. I am sure it will arrive in due course.

The specific concerns related to those graduate students found a good deal of sympathy within the ministry. We determined it would be well to delay any further implementation of the program announced in February 1982, in both its phases; and for all the universities, all the students and all the faculty in Ontario to understand clearly and to transmit to students who were enrolling from offshore, that that part of

the program for graduate students would be put in abeyance until that monitoring was completed.

We are equally as concerned as the member about the contribution foreign students make to our students' educational experience. We have always been concerned about the contribution foreign universities have made to the development of intellectual capital in Ontario. We have not forgotten that and we have made every effort to ensure our responsibilities in terms of foreign students, specifically in areas where the students were from developing countries, were totally met by this government and the people of Ontario and Canada. We shall continue to do that.

To suggest we will immediately change the project which was announced on February 18, 1982, would be foolhardy. To suggest we will be watching it carefully would be a very wise decision to make.

Mr. Allen: In the light of the fact foreign student registrations in the first year of university programs dropped last fall by something like 4,200 students, from 7,000 to 2,800, and in that some \$5,000 is spent by each student—

Hon. Miss Stephenson: What?

Mr. Allen: Sorry. Did I give a wrong figure? It is a drop in first-year programs from 7,000 to 2,700, a drop of 4,300.

Given that figure, and given that each student brings approximately \$5,000 to the local economy where he comes to reside, meaning in that simple statistic we have suffered a loss of about \$20 million in one year, would it not be wise for the minister to hold current student fees at their present level rather than increasing them at all next year, in order to continue to attract foreign students and their input into local economies pending the completion of the departmental review?

Hon. Miss Stephenson: The figures the honourable member uses are ones I have not heard before in terms of a total number of reductions. They are figures he must have acquired from some source to which I am not privy. The figures I have seen would demonstrate there has been a small but significant reduction in first-year enrolment of students in Ontario universities, and that is a matter which we will continue to monitor.

The position has been taken. It was announced in February 1982. I remind the member that is now 16 months ago. It was announced sufficiently clearly so everyone would be fully aware of the fact the two-phase program was to be in place. It

will be in place. I believe some of the institutions are making some changes in their own circumstances, since I gather they have announced that they failed to notify their applying students of the circumstances.

BORG-WARNER

Mr. Wrye: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour concerning the Employment Standards Act as it pertains to Borg-Warner, a manufacturing plant in Oakville. I am sure the minister is aware that this plant used to manufacture car radiators for Chrysler and that in July 1981 the employer effectively laid off more than 50 of the employees, advising them their services were no longer needed. The company then dismantled and sold most of its machinery required in the production of the radiators and so it has no capability at present of producing those radiators.

The employees, therefore, are certain—and I am sure the minister's employment standards people are aware—there has been a permanent discontinuance of all or part of the business of the employer in accordance with the act. The employer alleges that because it is prepared, at any time, to bid on a potential car radiator contract, there has been no permanent discontinuance. Since July 1981, approaching two years, the employees have been waiting for their severance entitlement. The ministry has been aware of this case now for over one year and refuses to make a ruling on whether the seemingly irrevocable closing-off of this company from the production of car radiators adds up to a permanent discontinuance.

Why is his ministry reluctant to arrive at the obvious conclusion that there has been a permanent discontinuance? How long must the employees wait? Does the minister not think it is time we looked at the phrasing of the term "permanent discontinuance" as it applies to the act?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the circumstances that have been described by my friend opposite. I must admit I am not immediately up to date on the present circumstances, but will make myself so and will report back to him either by letter or in this House.

MOTION

COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTIONS

Hon. Mr. Wells moved that the following substitutions be made: on the standing committee on general government, Mr. Cooke for Mr.

Charlton; on the standing committee on members' services, Mr. Charlton for Mr. Cassidy; on the standing committee on procedural affairs, Mr. Cassidy for Mr. Charlton; on the select committee on the Ombudsman, Mr. Philip for Mr. Cooke.

Motion agreed to.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

STAR OF PROGRESS SPIRITUAL CHURCH ACT

Ms. Fish moved, seconded by Mr. Cousens, first reading of Bill Pr23, An Act to revive the Star of Progress Spiritual Church.

Motion agreed to.

LABOUR RELATIONS AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Haggerty moved, seconded by Mr. Epp, first reading of Bill 31, An Act to amend the Labour Relations Act.

Motion agreed to.

3:30 p.m.

Mr. Haggerty: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to provide a mechanism whereby the Lieutenant Governor in Council can order a 60-day suspension of the strike or lockout and order a return to work where the strike or lockout constitutes an immediate and serious danger to life, health and safety or seriously disrupts the economy of the province or of any area of the province.

The bill provides that the Minister of Labour must appoint a conciliation officer where an order suspending a strike or lockout has been made, and may subsequently appoint a conciliation board where the efforts of the conciliation officer to effect a collective agreement are unsuccessful.

If conciliation efforts are unsuccessful, the strike or lockout may be resumed without a further strike vote. An order made under the bill would be enforceable as an order of the Supreme Court.

RESPONSE TO WRITTEN QUESTIONS

Mr. McClellan: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I would like to bring to the attention of the government House leader (Mr. Wells) the numerous violations of standing order 81(d) with respect to replying to written questions in Orders and Notices within 14 days. This having been brought to his attention, I trust it will be remedied, tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker: I am sure the government House leader will take note.

MOTION TO SET ASIDE ORDINARY BUSINESS

Mr. Rae moved, seconded by Mr. Foulds, that pursuant to standing order 34(a), the ordinary business of the House be set aside to debate a matter of urgent public importance, namely the unprecedented publication of apparent budget information several days before the official release date of the budget, the absence of a complete explanation as to how such a fundamental breakdown of security could have occurred and the ministerial responsibility and accountability of the Treasurer for such publication; and that this entire matter be referred to the standing committee on procedural affairs.

Mr. Speaker: I would like to advise the honourable members before we start any discussion that the motion has been received in time, and I will listen to the honourable member for up to five minutes as to why he thinks the ordinary business of the House should be set aside.

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, I do not think there can be any question that the events that came to our attention on Thursday evening and Thursday night, which we had a chance to discuss in the Legislature on Friday, are matters of urgent public importance. There can be no question that what took place—that is to say, the publication in the Globe and Mail of information that allegedly pertains to the budget that will be announced tomorrow by the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller)—amounts to an urgent situation. I think it is important for us not to overreact, but I think it is also important for us to put it in the context of a number of issues that have come to be accepted as basic traditions in this Legislature.

I do not want to enter into a debate again today on the question of the responsibility or otherwise of the Treasurer for what has taken place. The Treasurer has made his decision to go ahead with the budget tomorrow. I think we have to wait until tomorrow to see precisely what is contained in the budget and to see what steps then need to be taken.

Quite apart from this and quite apart from the discussions we had on Friday in this House with respect to the responsibility of the Treasurer, I do think there are matters here that are quite different from the question of privilege that you considered on Friday.

I respect the ruling you made this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, and I think the matter we are

asking to debate today is significantly different from the one we discussed on Friday. The discussion on Friday, as I am sure you will realize and remember, focused principally on the question of what the Treasurer knew, how he knew it and what he felt his responsibility was for the events as they took place. The substance of the motion I am putting before you is that this matter is of sufficient importance that it should be referred to the standing committee on procedural affairs.

We have operated on certain basic assumptions in this assembly, as have other legislatures that follow in the British parliamentary tradition, and I would say there are two key elements in that tradition with respect to the publication of budget information. The first is that budget information has to be kept secret and a leak or a release of that information prior to the publication of a budget in itself is cause for very real concern.

The second principle which has informed my understanding of the Constitution of Ontario and of our country, and which I think has informed the understanding of most people of the meaning of the parliamentary tradition, is that a minister is responsible and accountable to the Legislature not only for his own conduct or misconduct but also for the conduct or misconduct of his ministry.

With respect to budget secrecy, the arguments which we put forward on Friday were basically arguments, if you like, of strict liability. They were arguments which said that, however it may have been caused, a Treasurer was ultimately responsible for the release of budgetary information and that in the light of that practice of strict liability he had an obligation to offer his resignation once that information had been made public.

I do not pretend to have any monopoly on the answers to these questions. We were operating, and indeed are operating, on the assumption that certain rules have been in place and are there to be respected and that we are living in a society where majorities cannot simply change the rules willy-nilly in order to suit their understanding of the laws and traditions of our country and of our province.

That is why I would ask you, sir, in considering this motion, to consider that we are asking that it be referred to the standing committee on procedural affairs and that the standing committee itself would be bound to do two things, as we understand it: to examine what is going on, what are the facts of the situation; and also to

deal with the question of ministerial responsibility and accountability for the breach that may or may not have occurred.

We are entitled to an answer to those two questions. They can be answered only by a reasoned and considered approach by a standing committee of this Legislature which includes representatives of all three parties. Rules cannot be changed by the will of the majority, but have to be changed by the will of all the members of this Legislature.

Mr. Conway: Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of my colleagues to support the intent of the resolution standing in the name of the member for York South. I do so, having before me your ruling of earlier this afternoon, where in three pages you indicate to us that you do not imagine this to be a matter of privilege.

I have, of course, little or no choice but to accept that decision and I do so. However, accepting the ruling that this is not a matter of privilege, let me say that like, among others, the editorial board of the *St. Catharines Standard* of May 6, 1983, like the editorial writer of that newspaper, I see the matter to be none the less a matter of honour and principle.

It is, of course, a very important and serious matter for this Legislative Assembly, made more serious and more important because no less an honorable member than the Treasurer has set the standard for public morality vis-à-vis the handling of these matters. It has been referred to, on a number of occasions, that the Treasurer of Ontario has in recent days set the standard for public morality in this kind of situation.

I found it interesting that the Treasurer earlier today decided to lecture this House on some of the important questions to which this resolution directs our attention. In his response today, the Treasurer, responding to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Peterson), who was asking for a lifting up of the budgetary process, drew our attention to some of the cornerstones of British parliamentary democracy. He drew our attention to the principle of responsible government, that time-honoured tradition which sees an executive council discharging executive functions and ultimately being responsible to a Legislative Assembly.

3:40 p.m.

That, of course, is the principal cornerstone of our parliamentary democracy. But the essential component of that British parliamentary tradition, as MacGregor Dawson and others

have pointed out, is that turning on ministerial responsibility. It is a rigid and sometimes a harsh doctrine. It is a doctrine that is often relied upon by this government when it seeks to put off such reformist principles as freedom of information.

How many times have we in this assembly heard from ministers of the crown that they cannot open up the operations of government because that would dilute and compromise that principle known as ministerial responsibility? It has not been lost on me how, in this situation, so many in the current executive council are so willing and anxious to talk around the principle of ministerial responsibility.

However unfair, however harsh and however rigid is that doctrine, certainly my interpretation of the duty of the Treasurer is clear in this matter. Perhaps we will not be able to adjudicate finally until tomorrow afternoon at four o'clock, but my colleagues and I think it important that this Legislature deal with this matter in the standing committee on procedural affairs, as the resolution of the member for York South suggests.

We are struck by the role of the press in all of this. I wonder, thinking aloud, about the exact circumstances surrounding the leak at the Carswell Printing Co. Did a reporter randomly, on the first visit in the trash alley of the Carswell establishment in Don Mills, happen upon some not too well shredded galley proofs? Or was it a matter of an inside tip?

One can just imagine the volume of garbage a printing house generates. My office is not far from the Progressive Conservative Party and the Liberal Party printshop downstairs. What goes out of there daily is, to say the least, voluminous. I really wonder whether what happened at Don Mills last week was a random visitation or was there an inside tipoff.

This is a question this Legislature might look into. Perhaps it should constitute part of the inquiry of the Solicitor General (Mr. G. W. Taylor). These are questions which direct our attention to the fundamentals of the way in which we do our business here. I certainly hope the Legislature this afternoon could give individual members an opportunity to ventilate their views on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, we in the government have no objection to proceeding with this debate this afternoon. We feel that much of what could have been carried on in this debate was entered into by this House by the question of privilege raised on Friday. We had a

fairly wide-ranging debate on this matter then, but we would be most happy to hear all members' opinions on this motion. Therefore we would have no objection if you will, Mr. Speaker, that this emergency debate proceed.

Mr. Speaker: To address myself to the honourable government House leader, it is not my responsibility to rule that the debate will or will not proceed. My responsibility is either to find the motion in order or not in order. I do so find that the motion is in order. I put the question to the House: Shall the debate proceed?

Motion agreed to.

BUDGET SECURITY

Mr. Cooke: Mr. Speaker, this is the first opportunity I have had to speak with those silly clocks working to figure out whether I have done 10 minutes or not. I am glad to have the opportunity to participate in the debate. I am not sure I will take the full 10 minutes but I do want to raise a few of my views on this matter.

This whole matter of a budget leak gets down to one of the most basic aspects of the parliamentary system, and that is the aspect of ministerial responsibility. We understand the sketchy details that have now been released about the budget leak, as to how it happened, but there are still some very relevant questions in terms of what would have happened if someone else had gained access to this information, if there is any other information floating around or if the information was any kind of a setup. I assume that is what the Ontario Provincial Police are looking at.

I think a standing committee of the Legislature that would examine this matter should not only look at what happened with this leak and how it came about, but it is time the Legislature examined the role of all members of provincial parliament, all members of this assembly, in the budget process to see how that accountability can be increased and how more members can participate.

I do find some aspects of what has happened in the last few days rather alarming. For example, when the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) first became aware that there had been a leak and that the Globe and Mail did, in fact, have some information that appeared to be part of tomorrow's budget, I think it was incumbent on him to come into the Legislature last Thursday evening to report to all members of the assembly that this had occurred. Why he chose instead to speak with the press, why he decided to go on Metro Morning the next morning before speak-

ing to the members of the Legislature, why he played that kind of a game with such an important violation of an accepted parliamentary procedure, demonstrates a lot of things that have gone wrong in the Ontario Legislature since I have been a member.

I remember last year when we had the budget response the lack of respect the provincial Treasurer, the Premier (Mr. Davis) and the government itself showed for the Legislature. They held this place in contempt when we had perhaps two or three members, back-benchers of the Conservative Party, present for the response of the member for Rainy River (Mr. T. P. Reid) to the budget. That also occurs on throne speech debate responses from the opposition leaders, and it demonstrates very clearly that the government has lost respect for the Legislature and lost respect for the process. The only time they try to rekindle that respect in the process is when it suits them.

In this case, it suits the government to say this is not really a violation of parliamentary procedure and ministerial responsibility, that it is an outdated principle in any case and therefore it need not be respected. I became most upset with this whole incident when I read in today's *Globe and Mail* and yesterday's *Toronto Star* comments that the Premier decided to make to the Progressive Conservative women's group.

I want to quote from today's *Globe*. "In a scathing attack on the Liberals and NDP, Mr. Davis told about 150 members of the Progressive Conservative Association of Women that 'we must not allow ourselves to descend to the kind of total inconsistency and hypocrisy practised by the opposition at Queen's Park.'" He refers to us on this side acting in a hypocritical way when it was that government, whether it be the Premier or in this case the Treasurer, who took off the gloves the night of the federal budget and accused the federal government of violating parliamentary procedure when Mr. Lalonde decided he should not resign. It was the Treasurer who carried that to the extreme when he decided to have his photo session with his budget and mocked Mr. Lalonde even further by putting a comic magazine inside the budget cover.

I suggest anything that comes out of this budget leak, any of the embarrassment that has been placed on this government, has been increased by the Treasurer and his own tactics when it came to the rather stupid leak that occurred in Ottawa just a couple of weeks before. The Treasurer has set the tone for this

debate. He has set the tone of the whole debate on the budget leak by how he responded to Mr. Lalonde and the leak that occurred in Ottawa.

That is one of the reasons I have absolutely no sympathy with the provincial Treasurer for what has occurred. The responsibility, the practice and the principle of parliamentary procedures and ministerial responsibility are as relevant today in Tory Ontario as they were 10 years ago, or as they were two weeks ago in Ottawa when Mr. Lalonde showed his budget to Hamilton's channel 11 cameras.

3:50 p.m.

I would suggest that this does, however, give all of us the opportunity to participate in the debate and to take a closer look at the budgetary process in this province. I think it is time that we refer the matter to the procedural affairs committee of the Legislature, as suggested in this resolution, to take a look and see whether the system can be modernized.

I do not think the Treasurer should use this as a way out in this particular situation, but I do think it is something that members should examine to see if a system can be developed in which more members can participate; a system in which the entire budget, after it is tabled and read into the legislative record and responded to by the official critics, can then be debated by a committee of the Legislature with expert testimony.

Perhaps at that point a government would even be willing to accept some changes in the budget if the testimony indicated that it was reasonable to do so. In this way, all members of the Legislature would have the benefit of the experts who reside in our province, on both the business and the labour side as well as individual people, and we would all be able to act in a more responsible way when it came to budgetary matters both in estimates and, more particularly, in tax measures and economic strategy.

I have a couple of other points. One is that last week the government House leader made the point that this budget leak was not particularly relevant because it did not involve a tax measure. I think the government should realize—I know the Treasurer did back in 1979—that the Ontario health insurance plan premiums in this province are in fact tax measures. They raise more revenue than corporate income tax, and that fact was recognized in 1979 by the member for Muskoka in response to questions in this Legislature, in which he referred to it as a tax measure.

I think the principle of ministerial responsibility

ity is the most important aspect of this whole debate. If there is no acceptance of ministerial responsibility, whether it be with the Solicitor General (Mr. G. W. Taylor), the Treasurer or both, then there is something very seriously wrong with the system.

The security measures in this particular case did not work; that is obvious. I think the responsibility for the security measures certainly resides with both the Solicitor General and the Treasurer. This is something that cannot be sidestepped by this government.

We have to get an appropriate response, and I hope if the Treasurer joins the debate this afternoon he will also respond to those of us in the Legislature who feel rather offended. He was not here when I made these comments, so I will repeat them. We feel rather offended on two counts: first, that he did not have the courtesy or the respect for the Legislative Assembly to come in and talk about this matter or report to the Legislature last Thursday evening when he first knew about it; and second, on the whole aspect of his comments about Mr. Lalonde just a couple of weeks before.

Perhaps he can refresh the memories of all members of the Legislature about the comments he made in Leamington the night the federal budget came down: the comments about getting Mr. Lalonde off the hook for \$200 million on the budget leak. Those comments were made publicly, and the Treasurer has to accept that if he thinks Mr. Lalonde should resign, as was the case just a couple of weeks ago, then where does he stand on this matter? Where does he define exactly what ministerial responsibility means in this case?

I think a lot of these matters can be explored and defined for the future by a committee of this Legislature. If we can separate ourselves from the leak that occurred last week, I think a committee of the Legislature can look at this whole matter in a fairly nonpartisan way, and I think something good can come out of what was a very embarrassing situation for the government on Thursday last.

Mr. Conway: Mr. Speaker, I would first like to acknowledge with thanks the attendance of the Treasurer at the debate. Unlike the member for Windsor-Riverside (Mr. Cooke), I do have as one member to another a sense of sympathy for the Treasurer. I have not had the privilege of serving on the executive council but I hope there is not a member here, or I hope there are not too many members here, who cannot feel

deeply and personally for one of our colleagues who finds himself in this situation. It has to be difficult. It must be an extremely personal and difficult experience the Treasurer has gone through these past 72 hours.

Without malice and without prejudice I say to the Treasurer that, accepting the Speaker's ruling this is not a matter of privilege, it remains a matter of honour and a matter of principle.

However difficult, the Treasurer's duty as a minister of the crown is clear, in my reading of the British parliamentary tradition. When a minister of the crown is unable, for whatever reason, to discharge his extremely important executive responsibilities in conformity with his oath, the details of the circumstances surrounding his incapacity in that respect do not, it seems to me, make much difference in the final analysis. They might in a secondary way help to explain certain things, but the doctrine of ministerial responsibility has been tough and it has been rigid.

When a Treasurer, a Minister of Finance or a Chancellor of the Exchequer, for whatever reason, is not able to protect or guarantee the secrecy of his or her budget, I believe we have a clear case of a minister's responsibility not having been lived up to. I think the time-honoured tradition leads to only one honourable course.

Perhaps like other members, I would not feel as strongly about this as I do if the Treasurer of Ontario had not in recent days himself set the standard for public morality in this regard. The Treasurer, for whatever reason, was quick off the mark days ago in tendering gratuitous advice to the Minister of Finance for Canada as to what his obligation was with respect to the so-called leak that occurred, I believe, on April 17 or 18, a day or two before the Minister of Finance tendered his budget in the House of Commons.

Let me say further I do not share with others the belief that the situations in Ottawa and Toronto are as dissimilar as others would have us believe. I think the Minister of Finance for Canada might have reasonably expected that when the press came to his office for the customary photo opportunity they would have respected the conventions of budget secrecy and would not zoom in and try to get an early glimpse of the budget and, having received it through whatever technological process, then transmit it to the public at large. But they did so.

Of course the Treasurer, having knowledge

of that situation, had his photo opportunity. For whatever good reason, and I can imagine a few, he joked with the press by opening a copy of what I remember to be the 1983 budget with Scary Tales inside.

Hon. F. S. Miller: It was not a budget.

Mr. Conway: He shakes his head. He says it was not a 1983 budget. It was not a budget. Well, he opened what looked like a budget to those of us who saw it reported in the press and, of course, showed Scary Tales.

I say to the Treasurer he has responsibilities. He had to believe that, given what occurred in Ottawa, there might be some effort to breach the security which took the budget outside of his immediate control in the Frost Building. The press, in a very particular way, sought to inquire after the health of the Ontario budget and, as we found out last Thursday, was able to piece together galley proofs of same.

4 p.m.

In my earlier remarks I said that some of us, and I will speak personally, have to believe, given what the press received in the back alleys of Don Mills when it went looking for the scraps of paper that one would normally find in the garbage collection, that it is almost unreasonable to believe that they were able to go up there and, helter-skelter or at random, find the unshredded galley proofs that provided the basis for their story.

I have some grave suspicions about a tipoff from the inside. If in fact there is reason to believe there was a tipoff, that there was some measure of insider information, I have to think to myself what possible opportunity was there for other interested parties to take advantage of that situation?

Tomorrow, at four o'clock, the Treasurer is going to introduce in this place a budget which in some respects has been leaked. We will not know for sure until that time tomorrow afternoon when the Treasurer rises in his place to read the budgetary policy of this government for 1983-84.

But it bothers me more than a little bit to think that the Treasurer is proceeding with a budget that has been leaked in some measure, that he told us on Friday he could not guarantee he had contained or controlled all of that leaked information, and that tomorrow we are still going to get a budget that has been prepared and delivered under those kinds of conditions. I am worried about the extent to which the secrecy has been provided for and guaranteed.

I want to say something about the role of the press in this respect. I read the Toronto Globe and Mail editorial this morning. I find I am almost incapable of talking reasonably about that. I really wonder what the chief magistrate of this great Upper Canada of ours thinks about the consistency of the national newspaper.

I suppose, if nothing else, it tells us the editorial writers at the Toronto Globe and Mail continue as always to be scrupulously even handed in the way in which they opine in terms of federal and provincial policies.

I would never in this assembly stoop to the use of the word "hypocrisy." I could not bring myself to use the word "hypocrisy" in this place because, of course, as Beauchesne has told us, it is unparliamentary.

I wonder if the chief magistrate for Upper Canada is not trembling in his high seat, in his high chair of judgement over the consistency of our national newspaper. That editorial made it very difficult for some of us to hold down our breakfasts at an early hour this morning.

I want to say, in concluding, I have said to the member for Peterborough (Mr. Turner), who sits as Speaker of this place, that it has concerned a number of us over the past number of months about the frequency of leaks around here.

We saw for example a few months ago, perhaps it was even more recently than that, the situation about the lockup for the release of the Dubin inquiry report. I got a copy of the Toronto Star containing the headline story, apparently chapter and verse of that report which was being guarded in a lockup, as I walked into this place.

Mr. McClellan: The La Scala report.

Mr. Conway: My colleague the member for Bellwoods refers to it as the La Scala report.

I said to the member for Peterborough that I wanted that particular situation investigated because I felt somewhat suspicious about the circumstances surrounding the release of that report. Yes, it is true there are some of us on this side of the House who imagine, in fits of perhaps too partisan enthusiasm, that sometimes government ministers are wont to release, prior to the lockup's conclusion, a report to the press or certain parts of the press.

I wonder if in this respect the Ontario government has not itself been hoist with its own petard. I hope before we conclude this round of discussions the member for Peterborough will report to this House, with the help and the benefit of the Minister of Health (Mr. Gross-

man), the particular circumstances of how the so-called La Scala report, the La Scala version of the Dubin inquiry report on the Hospital for Sick Children in Toronto, managed to get into one of the Metropolitan dailies as and when it did.

In conclusion, this is a matter of honour. This is a matter of principle. I suspect no one knows and understands that more keenly than my friend the member for Muskoka (Mr. F. S. Miller). I hope he sets a high and good example in this respect not only for this Legislature but for the people beyond and for those who cherish the British parliamentary tradition.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I would begin by saying that ever since this event began last Thursday evening people have certainly come to know a lot more about the budget process and also about the Treasurer. Several things have come to light and several feelings are held by most people today.

First, the Treasurer, according to long-standing British tradition, has certainly taken all precautions humanly possible for him to take to prevent any of his budget becoming public before he presented it here. The Treasurer has stated that and I have no hesitation in saying it is so. I also have no hesitation in telling this House something of which it is very much aware. The great majority of the people of this province, the commentators, news writers and editorial writers support the Treasurer. No one believes he should resign except perhaps a few people on that side of the House.

We are not debating a motion asking for the resignation of the Treasurer. There is nothing in this motion that suggests the Treasurer should resign. The only calls for his resignation come in the individual speeches made on this motion. I do not think there is anyone in this House who does not believe in the long-standing British parliamentary tradition surrounding the budget. We all believe in that and we all practise that. We would all believe that if those long-standing traditions were broken certainly a minister of finance, a chancellor of the exchequer, or a treasurer should resign.

What does Eugene Forsey say are those long-standing British traditions about the budget? He says—

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Eugene Forsey used to be a very respected member of that party.

Mr. McClellan: He has belonged to all three

parties. If there were four parties he would have belonged to all four.

Mr. Conway: You had better be careful. I didn't talk about Erik Nielsen.

Hon. Mr. Wells: He is certainly not one of our party. I do not care what those members argue or call back about Eugene Forsey or what the member for Renfrew North says about him or anyone else. I am sure he would not—

Mr. Conway: I didn't mention Erik Nielsen because I didn't want to be personal.

Hon. Mr. Wells: In the context in which we are talking, a person like Erik Nielsen is not in the same category as Eugene Forsey when it comes to British traditions or a thorough knowledge of the British parliamentary system. Whether members agree with his opinions or not, Eugene Forsey is recognized as one of the eminent Canadian students in this field. I would not differ with that opinion which is held by many people. It is the opinion I myself hold.

Eugene Forsey says the tradition of secrecy is based on the need to prevent people with prior knowledge of what is in the budget from making a financial killing. Then he says in this letter that was printed, "What is out of date about that?"

There is nothing out of date about that principle. That principle sticks, and I think every member of this House believes in it—including myself, the Treasurer and the members of this government.

Mr. Nixon: What letter is the member quoting from?

4:10 p.m.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I am quoting a letter that appeared in one of the newspapers. It was a letter to the editor of the Globe and Mail. It concerned the Lalonde leak. As members will recall, after that leak the federal Minister of Finance suggested that perhaps there should be some change in the whole idea we have about secrecy concerning the budget and perhaps some new procedures.

Eugene Forsey was writing this letter to say: "What's out of date about all this? It's a long-standing principle. No one should make a killing out of budget leaks. Maybe even the federal Minister of Finance is wrong now in starting to use what happened to him as an excuse for saying we should change the whole system."

Interjection.

The Deputy Speaker: I just remind all members that this is not a debate.

Hon. Mr. Wells: What I want to say is that if we take Eugene Forsey's statement of what this principle really is, that the release of tax information allows an individual to make a private gain or a killing, and apply that to this particular situation, it certainly does not apply.

Mr. Conway: We don't know that.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well, first of all, I want to say that my friend the Treasurer tells me the *Globe and Mail* has sworn an affidavit that it has no further information than what was published; and certainly no one else has come forward to—

Mr. T. P. Reid: Why didn't the Treasurer tell us that?

Hon. Mr. Wells: It has just now come to light and he has indicated that to me.

The point now is, what is the information that was published in the *Globe and Mail*? First, the information concerned an increase in the Ontario health insurance plan premiums. Although they may have been considered from time to time as a tax measure, at the present time, in terms of the Inflation Restraint Board and its ruling, OHIP premiums are considered a regulated price and therefore a change in them is not, in the strictest sense of the word, a tax measure.

Besides, let someone tell me who is to gain from knowing whether there is to be an increase in OHIP premiums. It certainly is not the kind of measure that could cause some private gain, such as the disclosure of a sales tax change, a corporation tax change or something of that nature.

Mr. Conway: That is assuming somebody else didn't find another garbage bag with other information.

Hon. Mr. Wells: We are assuming that has not happened; and until that happens—

Mr. Conway: Do you know that for sure?

Hon. Mr. Wells: It is all very well to assume that, but we are talking about the specifics of the incident that has occurred.

The second matter that was disclosed in the *Globe and Mail* story concerned estimates, and it concerned what has been viewed as the prior release of information about some of the appropriations and money that were going to particular ministries of this government.

My friends across the floor all know that in past years we have tabled the estimates in this House prior to the budget. We have tabled them sometimes three or four weeks prior to the budget.

Mr. Laughren: Here?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Yes. We have tabled them in here. But the point is, they had nothing to do with budget secrecy or the accountability of the Treasurer.

Mr. Conway: Why was the Treasurer so hard on Mr. Lalonde then, because he did not know before?

The Deputy Speaker: I remind the member for Renfrew North that he has had his opportunity. The government House leader may continue.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Let me just say that in the context of what the *Globe and Mail* picked up from a garbage bag and printed in its newspaper, there was nothing that falls within my concept or the general concept of a tax leak that would account for private gain to an individual and would suggest that a Treasurer or a Chancellor of the Exchequer should resign, such as Hugh Dalton did in the 1947 case. That just does not apply.

I just want to conclude by saying that I and this government see no point in having the standing committee on procedural affairs study this matter, because there is no one on the procedural affairs committee who would have had any experience with the preparation of a budget. That, I think, severely hampers them in their determination. I say that because I sat in on a study group that was talking about how budgets should be prepared. It was calling for more openness. In that group there was one person who had been a former finance minister of this country. He said: "Just a minute, fellows, you don't know anything about it. You all can talk academically about this but unless you have ever prepared a budget you really do not understand the procedures."

Mr. Foulds: That is like saying the select committee cannot look at nuclear reactors because it does not have prior knowledge. Do not be silly.

Hon. Mr. Wells: No, in this case I think we have many more important things for the procedural affairs committee to do, including revising the rules of this House.

Let me just conclude by quoting from the last section of the *Globe and Mail* editorial which said today: "Frank Miller is an honourable man caught in a great embarrassment not of his making. He should remain in his post as Treasurer and take measures to make his next budget as secure as he thought this one would be."

I have full confidence that out of this the Treasurer will be able to take those steps.

Mr. McClellan: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to respond to some of the comments of my honourable friend the government House leader, who had the chutzpah to quote Eugene Forsey on the subject of secrecy of the budget in connection with Marc Lalonde, while at the same time sitting beside the very man who, pre-eminently I think in the political field, was calling for Marc Lalonde's head on a platter.

Mr. Conway: You heard that too.

Mr. McClellan: I believe I heard the honourable Treasurer of Ontario demanding the resignation of the Minister of Finance in Ottawa. I believe I saw him mocking Marc Lalonde on television with the funny, comic book cutout.

Mr. Mackenzie: That is the only thing he is embarrassed about.

Mr. McClellan: I think my friend shows a fair degree of nerve and audacity quoting Eugene Forsey in defence of Marc Lalonde's right to stay on as Minister of Finance when his colleague beside him has been so vociferous in the opposite point of view.

As my friend rightly pointed out, we are not debating the question of resignation or no resignation.

Mr. Kolyn: Why don't you quote the senator now?

Mr. McClellan: I do not have the senator's sacred text in front of me, but we are not debating the question of resignation or no resignation.

Mr. Martel: You are the ones who demanded the resignation, not us.

Mr. McClellan: We are debating the question of whether the matter should be referred to a standing committee so that the matter set out in the resolution can be looked at rationally. It does not do anybody's peace of mind any good to make reference to this morning's editorial in the *Globe and Mail*, talking about chutzpah and audacity, nerve and gall. For a newspaper to precipitate our dear Treasurer into this jackpot in the first place and then, Pontius Pilate-like, wash its hands of all responsibility or complicity verges on farce.

The third point, in response to the government House leader, has to do with the Ontario health insurance plan. For some reason, the government House leader does not seem to understand that OHIP is a tax on the people of this province. I think I set it down but I have a reference in Hansard where the Treasurer himself—page 946 of Hansard, April 12, 1979

—referred to OHIP premium increases as a taxation measure. This particular taxation measure raises \$1.4 billion, which is more than the government raises from corporation tax.

The government House leader knows full well that for many companies and many employees and employers OHIP is a de facto payroll tax, that OHIP premiums are covered under collective agreements. The collective agreement clauses stipulate that if OHIP goes up, the employer who is paying the share of OHIP on behalf of the employee will automatically pick up the increase. If there is an increase in OHIP premiums, it has an impact on many companies in this province in exactly the same way that an increase in any other kind of tax does. When companies are working out their pricing policies in relation to their competitors, they will bear this reality in mind, so companies that have advance knowledge of the impending OHIP tax increase of five per cent will begin to fold it into their pricing calculations immediately upon receiving it. So we cannot pretend that it does not have an impact; it does.

4:20 p.m.

I suppose one of the reasons that perhaps the government can get away with the leak of an OHIP premium tax increase as opposed to that of a sales tax increase, a corporation tax increase or a personal income tax increase is that so many citizens are not affected as businesses or corporations; they are simply low-income people for whom the OHIP premium is already an overwhelming burden, or perhaps they are among the many thousands of people who simply cannot afford OHIP premium coverage in this province at all because of the cost.

One of the reasons that a reference to a standing committee would be useful—and it does not have to be the procedural affairs committee; if the government House leader has another committee up his sleeve that is less burdened with—

Mr. Nixon: He has got lots of committees up his sleeve.

Mr. McClellan: Well, the House leader of the Liberal Party has things up two sleeves with respect to the procedural affairs committee—as does my House leader, I regret to say.

If that committee is too busy with the rules changes, perhaps there are other places it could go; but the government will have to come up with a more plausible rationale for not referring it to committee than the fact that it should not be the procedural affairs committee.

There are unanswered questions as to whether the budget leak was theft or whether it was negligence. We have heard from the company, giving its self-exoneration here in the House and in the media outside, and the extent to which the Treasurer has joined in this process of self-exoneration.

But really, the facts of the leak are quite preposterous. There is a contract between the government, the printing company and the Ontario Provincial Police. Security, the prevention of leaks and the preservation of secrecy are the responsibility of the Treasurer. Written into his contract with the printing company is an obligation to enforce and maintain secrecy. The OPP, those vigilant guardians of law and order, is brought into the printing company premises to ensure the terms of the secrecy provisions of the contract are carried out. All material that is not to be used is supposed to be shredded. There are OPP on the premises.

This company has had the contract for over 10 years; presumably it knows what its obligations are. And what happens? Key portions of the budget in the form of galley proofs are carefully—I assume under the vigilant eyes of the OPP and the management of the printing company—deposited in a green garbage bag. Perhaps the material was escorted under armed guard to the receptacle, carefully put in the Glad bag and perhaps tied with a little string. Then, after they made sure the material had been placed in the proper receptacle according to the terms of the contract and the traditions of secrecy in force at the company, they carefully deposited the documents in the back alley of the company—at least, I understand it was the back alley.

Hon. G. W. Taylor: The Globe says “abandoned.”

Mr. McClellan: Oh yes, the Globe and Mail says it was abandoned, but the position of the government, I believe, and of the printing company is that the secrecy provisions of the contract were being fully maintained and there was nothing untoward going on in this place.

I cannot credit the words of the Solicitor General that this material was abandoned in the back alley. I assume this was part of their security regime. I assume that, having placed the galley proofs in the green garbage bag, they then took them under armed escort and carefully deposited the documents on their private property—unfortunately outside rather than inside. But, of course, who can quibble with

security arrangements under the watchful visage of the OPP with a 10-year history behind it?

Mr. Conway: And they hadn't been to La Scala.

Mr. McClellan: They had not even been to La Scala, we are told by the member for Renfrew North.

There is obviously also an element of farce in the events surrounding the leak. The question of whether it was theft or negligence is not one that can be easily answered, but neither can it be easily dismissed. It is the responsibility of the Treasurer to maintain secrecy.

His only defence, we believe, is the defence of surreptitious entry and theft in violation of the law. I believe that is his only plausible defence.

I am not at all sure that this is what we are looking at here. I am not at all sure that taking essential government budget documents, placing them in a green garbage bag, throwing them outside for the garbage man to pick up and having somebody then obtain those documents falls under the purview of the Criminal Code. It sure does not fall under the purview of my criminal code. Anybody is welcome to go through my garbage.

Mr. Conway: We have seen confidential medical records left around.

Mr. McClellan: It is not unprecedented. I think there are questions that need to be answered, and a referral to a committee makes perfectly good sense.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I see the Treasurer and the government House leader have left the House briefly; I suppose I can direct my remarks to the chairman of the standing committee on procedural affairs. If the intent of this motion is successful, then the matter will be placed in his hands, or at least in the hands of the procedural affairs committee under his direction.

I am not at all sure that is not a good disposition, but I should point out to you, sir, that there is no motion before the House which will result in a vote of the House. That is one of the reasons why I was quite glad on Friday last, when the matter was more emergent than it is now, that we had a chance to debate it on the basis of a point of privilege rather than in a debate on a matter of urgent public importance, so called, which really does not end up in any substantial disposition.

It is possible that the House, by its agreement, may pass a motion, a resolution of some sort, that would send the matter to the committee. I think that would be quite worth while.

I think you should be aware, Mr. Speaker, if you are not personally so aware already, that the Treasurer in his comments to Broadcast News, at the time of Mr. Lalonde's difficulties with his budget, was quite clear. He did not emphasize the fact that it is only in circumstances where tax information is divulged that the Treasurer is called upon to relinquish his post.

He made it quite clear in his comments, although I thought he was a bit condescending. I forget the exact words, but they were something like, "We, in this special group of ministers of finance and treasurers" Knowing the minister, I am sure he did not mean to be condescending, but he said, "In this special and select group we know the requirement under the understood or written rules of British tradition that if budgetary information is leaked before the presentation of the budget then the Treasurer has no alternative but to resign his post."

I believe he is correct in that, although it is very difficult for anyone to understand, certainly the government House leader and many of the people outside this House who are not closely associated with these traditions. They think, "If somebody does not go out on the stock exchange, the real estate market or the live-stock market, if there is nobody one can point a finger at and say he made a killing because of the release of this information, what damage has been done?"

It is difficult to answer that question other than to quote the Treasurer himself. He said it is a fundamental basis of the responsibility of ministers of finance and treasurers that if this budgetary information is released, inadvertently or deliberately, the Treasurer has no alternative but to resign.

It seems to be very draconian punishment indeed, but he understood the rules; and he undertook, through his staff and his unlimited budget, to see that no danger was pressing in on him that this information would be public.

I am sure it never entered his mind, particularly after the kerfuffle—if there is such a word that Hansard can look after—in Ottawa, that such a thing would ever happen in the well-ordered emanations of the Treasury of Ontario. But it did.

My own feeling is that I somewhat regret the fact that the Treasurer has been faced with this. He has many other problems and we want to get to them. We want to get to the budget as soon as we can.

4:30 p.m.

The government House leader has argued that no information was made public that would have any influence on the stock market or the markets, or even on the possibility of any individual in making a gain or a loss. I made the point before he resumed his seat that in the words of the Treasurer himself that argument is irrelevant—interesting but irrelevant. The Treasurer has said that if budgetary information is prereleased through anybody's fault, the Treasurer must carry the responsibility and offer his resignation.

However, I want to put this for the interest of the government House leader and others: The information was released in the *Globe and Mail* that the budgetary allocation for the Ministry of Agriculture and Food would be reduced by 13 per cent. It is true that in other years such information has been presented to the House, but only by the Treasurer or the responsible minister presenting it to this House so it was then available to everyone in the province at the same time.

Obviously, when this is in the bulldog edition on page 7 of the *Globe and Mail* of May 6, it is not available to everyone at the same time. If you can tell me, Mr. Speaker, that this would have no influence on the credit of farmers or the decisions they would be making at planting time, I simply cannot accept it. There is a tendency for most members in this House to say, "Oh, well, that is the farmers and they are always in trouble or say they are anyway." They do not take it seriously. I say it is a serious matter of particular concern to the farmers in my riding, in Quinte and elsewhere who are facing the extreme problems of the farm economy at the present time.

We might even refer to the fact that the leaked information indicates a reduction in the Industry and Trade budget of 38 per cent. Someone has said, by whispering across the House, "That is because we gave a lot of money to Massey-Ferguson last year, and we are not going to do that again."

What about that? White Farm Equipment in Brantford is in an extreme position similar to Massey, and the fact that the government is going to take no action might be the last straw that puts it into receivership this week. There is nothing extreme about that prediction. It has already been made publicly by our local elected democratic socialist member of Parliament, and there is every indication such a thing might occur.

The government House leader is indicating

that whatever information has been brought forward is not of any significance. I cannot accept that. It is a little difficult to me to make both sides of the argument as to whether it is relevant as far as gain or loss on the stock market or in business is concerned when, according to the Treasurer himself, if information is released that is factual, he has no alternative under the traditions, parliamentary and otherwise, but to offer his resignation.

That means we are right now in the calm in the eye of the hurricane because tomorrow, when he reads his budget and it becomes apparent that this information was prereleased, I think only the Treasurer knows his course of action. It would seem to me, based on his previous statements, that he would have no alternative but to offer his resignation.

I think the government House leader is right when he says most commentators and even the editorial writers of the *Globe and Mail* itself feel this does not necessarily call for his resignation. Probably the same argument could have been made about Darcy McKeough when his rubber stamp occurred on an approval for a subdivision in his own area when he did not even know such an approval had been made; but it did not take him more than 10 minutes to decide that under the circumstances he had no alternative but to do what he considered the honourable thing and resign his position.

I have another regret I want to put to you, Mr. Speaker, in the minute or two remaining to me. I really felt that Mr. Speaker's ruling on the question of privilege was extremely well drawn and had all sorts of good precedents for its basis, but I still regret the fact that he made the decision he did.

The operative part, and I quote from his first page is, "To be considered a question of privilege, a matter must pertain to a right which the ordinary citizen does not enjoy." I submit the right is to be the first to hear the government's decision on the basis of budgetary policy. If things were to be done fairly, all the citizens should hear it at the same time. Since that is not possible, then we as their representatives have the right and the privilege to hear this material, representing all parts of the province and all citizens at the same time.

I still submit, and I hope I am not out of order in so doing, that I regret Mr. Speaker and his predecessors in other places have all determined that this is not a matter of privilege. In my view, making it a matter of privilege is the only thing that gives any rationality to the traditions

of budget secrecy as they are. If it can be shown that the privileges of the members of this House or of any other House have been transgressed by a treasurer or any other minister in that regard, it should call for an automatic resignation when Mr. Speaker, in this House or elsewhere, comes to the conclusion that such a transgression has occurred.

I therefore feel quite strongly that the test in this whole matter will come tomorrow afternoon; it will not be at the end of this debate, since there is no vote. I do not think there will be a meeting of minds, since I see our expert in horseflesh over there, the Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Drea), getting ready to express his views on this matter. I really was hoping he would.

My own definite contention is that this thing will be tested when the budget is read in the House tomorrow. We have the information that was printed in Canada's national newspaper. If we find that information is valid and that a part of the budget did become public, then I would certainly expect, sincerely expect, the Treasurer will offer his resignation. What the Premier does with it at that point, of course, is a matter of his judgement. We, like all members of the House, will look forward to these events with a great deal of interest.

Hon. G. W. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, I viewed with amusement this morning's *Globe and Mail* editorial. I had already completed my breakfast, so it did not cause me the same concern as it did the member for Renfrew North. The sentence in it that I found particularly amusing was, "If anyone should be contemplating resignation, perhaps it should be the man responsible for the OPP—Solicitor General George Taylor."

One is sometimes pleased that his name is used in such a prominent newspaper as the *Globe and Mail*. However, I did not contemplate resigning. I will not be contemplating such a course, but if I did contemplate offering the Premier my resignation I would probably think of a very interesting way to do it. Perhaps I would place it in a green garbage bag on some private property in Metropolitan Toronto and the first *Globe and Mail* reporter to find it would receive a bonus. However, I suspect that would not be their contemplation and I will not be doing that.

I noticed with amusement another phrase in there: "two bags of garbage abandoned." Without commenting on the seriousness of the situation, one wonders when garbage becomes

abandoned or whether it is abandoned as described in the editorial.

I remember going on a bicycle marathon with another lawyer on a day that happened to be a garbage day. After proceeding for some two hours we began to discuss when title or property passed in garbage. It provided a great deal of amusement for two lawyers going along on a pleasant afternoon discussing when title to two bags of garbage might pass. Not very interesting perhaps; however, one might say there will be great difficulty in this situation as to when the property in green garbage bags passes or might be described as abandoned.

One might contemplate all the situations. When I look at all the boxes around Metropolitan Toronto and other places, I ask myself about the documents labelled "The Globe and Mail" and stored in those boxes. Is that property abandoned? One might describe some of the material in there as garbage; therefore, is it abandoned and do we no longer have to put in a quarter for those documents and 50 cents on the weekend? How it achieves a greater notoriety on the weekend is difficult to imagine.

4:40 p.m.

I also looked with amusement at some of the things in here as to how the Globe and Mail might describe the new process of victims of crime where, if a crime happened to be contemplated, it might even say, "Hang the victim," with the logic it has presented with the editorial of today. However, one might not say it is as hypothetical as what is taking place.

One might even look at the Watergate plumb-ers. The Watergate plumbers would be running the Globe and Mail at present by the logic it has used in some of its editorial positions. I have great difficulty contemplating how they can print the story, whether or not it is accurate, whether or not the details are accurate, whether or not it is what they say it is. That is for somebody else to speculate on and maybe to discover.

Yet one follows that through and says in the next phrase, as the member for Renfrew North says, how can they put in an editorial and say, "Our editorial board is clean, perfect, without being confused by the facts of what we printed in our newspaper of a previous day, whether they are accurate or not"? I might say that when the Globe and Mail perhaps has been caught with its hand in the cookie jar, it looks around for somebody else who might take the blame.

The Treasurer has great public support, and I must not deny that. I think he has that both through the other areas of the media and

through the public of Ontario. The Globe and Mail says: "Let's go hang the Solicitor General. He was obviously responsible for security. Let's get somebody—not us for the way we gained our information, whatever way it was gained, and not us for printing that information, however it might have been received and whatever problems it may cause to the Treasurer or to the budgetary process. Let's get somebody else."

They have fine logic on that editorial board. It gives me great pleasure to know I am not alone in this condemnation of that newspaper at this time. One does not lightly attack the media and suggest that in some respects they may even be inaccurate in what they are doing or that one of its editorial boards may not be properly putting forth its material. All the other areas of the media condemn that newspaper, one that labels itself the national newspaper although I regret that it does not print a quarter of its newspaper in French. Still, that is their problem. They do call themselves a national newspaper.

One wonders who might be calling for whose resignation. If one happened to be the owner, the editor and the publisher of that newspaper, one might say to the reporter who used such a process: "Why don't you come in here and hand that resignation to me as a reporter? I don't want anybody on my staff who goes digging through garbage bags like the local wino trying to find some substance to report about. It's not the best reporting tactics."

However, taking the Ontario Provincial Police's responsibility, as it has been labelled, I must say that I think it is a fine force. The security was carried out and, without putting too much responsibility, there was a certain responsibility on the printers. In this day and age when so much has to be put in print, I think there is a trust in printers that they will, first, provide a certain amount of security and, second, perform their task.

One has to recognize there is a possibility that material may not be looked at by other people once it is put in print, once it is going through a printing process. I find the method here very rudimentary. If one wants to challenge that security, and it is the security we are discussing, rummaging through garbage bags surely is most rudimentary. With all the economic forces available today, and the sophistication that is available, one has to wonder about such a rudimentary process as rummaging through green garbage bags.

There are many advanced techniques one has to look at if one wants to break the security. One

would do it with far more sophistication than that if one wanted to test the security, because it is not that sophisticated. There has to be a certain amount of trust. Therefore, I find no difficulty in saying that this matter now being investigated by the Ontario Provincial Police would not be served well in any way by being before a committee that could do any better job of investigating it than is currently going on.

Indeed, I think it is far too premature, as the document says here, "in the absence of a complete explanation as to how such a fundamental breakdown in security could have occurred." When this was asked, the Treasurer would not know what and how a complete explanation could be able to be given at that time. It would be impossible. They are demanding a complete explanation long before it is available. There is an ongoing investigation at present.

As to the ministerial responsibility, there is a certain amount of ministerial responsibility in theory and in fact. But in this situation, in fact and in theory, it is not one that this minister, the Treasurer, should be held accountable for in any way. I see no way that he should in any respect offer or even contemplate a resignation, as has been asked throughout this debate. As to the suggestion in the Globe editorial, I have not even contemplated it.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, one can only suggest that there is some poetic justice here. I was sitting last week reading the newspaper, and there was the Treasurer poking fun at none other than Marc Lalonde. He had what we heard him say today was his phoney budget, his comic book. It was really a comic book, but not a real budget. I thought to myself then that one should not be so smug, because one can never tell in this business when it is going to catch up to him.

I was delighted Thursday night when I found out the scoundrel who had caught up to him, not because I am pleased to see him squirm, but because while one can kick somebody else in the head, one has to stand back: when someone is flinging that stuff, some of it always sticks. With the Treasurer, it has stuck, except that he went even further when it occurred. Members of the cabinet have got up to defend him, but no one wants to speak to what the Treasurer said when he was commenting on Marc Lalonde. He said he must resign. Now nary a Tory back-bencher, nor a cabinet front-bencher for that matter, is speaking to that.

The morality, as my friend the member for

Renfrew North says, is established by none other than the Treasurer. That morality did not last very long, mind—only until he got caught with his fingers, as the Solicitor General just said, in the cookie jar. The poison he was prepared to mete out just two or three weeks ago is as applicable to him as to someone else.

Mr. Cooke: But the Premier says—

Mr. Martel: I want to get to the Premier; he is next. That fellow who could not get enough votes to get a coronation is back with us. There is not a guy I have known over the years who could slug below the belt better and be more sanctimonious than the Premier and not have anyone from the press even comment.

Listen to his shots today at the member for St. Catharines. I think he said his lip was moving before his brain. That is okay. Nobody ever says that to the Premier, except when the member for Huron-Middlesex (Mr. Riddell)—and I read Hansard very deliberately—made some comment with respect to the funding and the Premier became very indignant about it, very upset, and he said, "Jack Riddell, you will pay for this," or words to that effect.

4:50 p.m.

What did the Premier say when he was speaking to the good Progressive Conservative women? Let me quote: "In a scathing attack on the Liberals and the NDP, Mr. Davis told about 150 members of the Progressive Conservative Association of Women that 'We must not allow ourselves to descend to the kind of total inconsistency and hypocrisy practised by the opposition at Queen's Park.'"

What the hell does he say when his Treasurer says to the federal Minister of Finance, "You have got to resign"? He says, "That is not applicable." And we are the hypocrites?

The Premier should not tell me about hypocrisy and about hitting below the belt, because he is a master at it. No one has caught up with him yet. He does it daily in here. He says, "I do not want to say this about the member, and I will not"; then he goes on to say it, and it is a great joke. For hypocrisy the Premier tops them all, because it was his Treasurer who called for a resignation.

I think the type of thing we saw in the past might be too harsh; I would be the first one to suggest that. That is why our resolution says it should go to a committee, because maybe the penalty is too harsh to suit the crime, if I may use that term as an analogy. It is not a crime in the sense of anything being crooked or perverse.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Cousens): I just draw to the attention of the member for Sudbury East, without breaking his flow, that he is verging on unparliamentary language with the term "hypocrisy." I think he is just close—

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, I am quoting—

The Acting Speaker: I thank the honourable member for remembering that we are in the House and that it requires great care in how he phrases these expressions.

Mr. Martel: Is it okay for the Premier to go outside this building and call everyone else a hypocrite? Does it just work one way?

The Acting Speaker: I would just say to the honourable member that here in the House there are rules that we ask him to abide by.

Mr. Martel: Well, you cannot have it both ways.

The Acting Speaker: In the House there are rules.

Mr. Martel: The Premier cannot leave this place and call members of the opposition hypocritical while we cannot come here and even quote him because we verge on saying something wrong.

Let me get back to my train of thought. You broke it, Mr. Speaker; I appreciate your doing that for me.

I think the price one pays for the crime—and, as I said, I do not mean it in the sense of anything criminal—on the basis of the traditions of years gone by might be a little harsh. One might want to send it to a committee. If a worker is caught doing something wrong, there is usually a penalty. Maybe we could have something such as they have in sports: you can clobber someone on the head and get a 10-game suspension. We might look at something like that, not at something that comes out of the Dark Ages; something that is responsive and makes the person responsible for carrying such a weighty job so that he too can be called to task in some manner that does not destroy him.

We might want to look at it in a committee structure to see whether the past is really relevant, because far too many things in this place are tradition-bound and out of date. That may be why this place can be so useless much of the time. Maybe if we started to put this place in the 20th century we might have a place that had some meaning. All you have to do is take a look around here every day and there is no one here. I suggest that much of the reason is that what we do is—

An hon. member: Irrelevant.

Mr. Martel: And most of the public think it is irrelevant.

I cannot help but feel sorry for my friend the member who used to be the chairman of the standing committee on procedural affairs and who was shuffled aside just recently because he is one of those members who wanted to open up the process—

Mr. Cunningham: Who was that man?

Mr. Nixon: Who was that masked man?

Mr. Martel: The member for Burlington South (Mr. Kerr), who wanted to open up some of the procedures.

Budget speeches and throne speeches are silly around here in a majority parliament because, once they are introduced, that is the end of it; one might as well vote and go home. In fact, democracy in a majority goes out the window for four years by and large, because once something is brought in by government, that is it. All the back-benchers get up when they are told, raise their hands when they are told and sit down and shut up when they are told. That is the democratic process here.

In England, when we were there, it was somewhat different. Back-benchers there realize they have a role. It is not just to be told when to raise their hands; they object, and they object openly. But this is not the case in Ontario or in Ottawa, because one might not get a cabinet post and one might embarrass one's government.

When we were in England the member for York Centre (Mr. Cousens) learned the back-benchers there were somewhat more independent and it made the government more responsible. But that is not the case around here, not even with contradiction. If we get a budget tomorrow, all will be said and done. People can rail away for two or three weeks, but what is the difference? The Treasurer said it today: we will go in and vote and that is it.

The government might open up the process so that people, including the Tory back-benchers, have the feeling they are contributing something. I have talked to most of them, and I suspect they do not really feel they contribute a hell of a lot, but they might want to do something.

The member for Burlington South wanted to do that, so they moved him. But in that whole process of ministerial responsibility there might be an opening-up of the process so that other people could have something to say. The government might not have to accept it, but at least

there would be an opportunity before the die is cast to contribute something, and we do not do that in our society.

That was the second reason we wanted this to go to the procedural affairs committee. One reason was to look at the responsibility and the accountability, and the other was the security.

I must say, as I take my place, that this happened five days ago. We are into Monday afternoon at five o'clock and we have not heard anything yet with respect to what the real facts were as to what went on, not even a statement to try to lay some of it to rest. I think that is an indication of what is wrong with this government: the fact that the Treasurer did not come in when it occurred, and we are now down to the crunch and we still have not even got at least a preliminary report. To hell with the facts.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of interest that I rise to speak on the motion before us.

I recall that I was on my feet for a little more than eight hours after the budget last year to force the government to send the retail sales tax bill to committee with the proviso that the Tory majority on that committee would not block the opposition attempts to hear testimony from the public. I find it passing strange that those on the opposite side would be adopting the stance that they have in terms of the budgetary process as it now exists.

The Treasurer, in response to a question raised earlier today by myself, said that the opposition can refer any bill to the committee it chooses. That is true, of course, but with the Tory majority—

Mr. Martel: We cannot debate it.

Mr. T. P. Reid: We cannot debate it. With the Tory majority, they can stifle any kind of debate, particularly from outside, by not accepting our proposals to have the public come in and explain what impact the budget is having on their everyday lives.

The intent of this motion—and I would have hoped the government itself would have put such a motion or will put such a motion—is obviously so that we can deal in a more open and knowledgeable way with the budgetary process than we have in the past.

My leader made a speech last year on this subject. I have made comments, my friends on my left have made comments, and the Canadian Tax Foundation has made comments. Everybody is satisfied with the process until something goes wrong. Surely the public at large

should have the opportunity to question the minister and his officials, as should the members of the House, who, I should point out to you, Mr. Speaker, did not and would not have had that opportunity after the last budget if I had not gone to some lengths and finally worn the government down and convinced it of the efficacy of my point of view.

The related matter, of course, is whether the Treasurer resigns. I feel that, as with most things around here, this is a bit of a tempest in a teapot. I feel the Treasurer has put himself behind the proverbial eight ball, as my friend the member for Sudbury East (Mr. Martel) just mentioned, with his cute comment about Mr. Lalonde's difficulty and with his comic book inside the budget.

5 p.m.

As a matter of fact, as I thought of this on the weekend, one could almost envisage some smart young reporter on his way up sitting in the Globe and Mail newsroom and saying to himself, "Well"—

Mr. Rae: Lois.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Lois? "Clark, I will just see how smart Mr. Miller is, how good his security is and just how cute he will be if we can find something on him."

Mr. Rae: Good idea, Clark.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Clark said to Lois, "That sounds like a good idea," and they immediately rushed out to the garbage bags.

I find the Treasurer is hoist on his own petard in this instance—not that I want to add to the general comments about whether he should resign or not.

I draw to the Speaker's attention section 1(b) of the rules, "In all contingencies not provided for in the standing orders the question shall be decided by the Speaker or Chairman, and in making his ruling, the Speaker or Chairman shall base his decision on the usages and precedents of the Legislature and parliamentary tradition." Just as a short history lesson, that rule was changed at the request of some of us. When I first came to the House we made our decisions based on British parliamentary tradition. We now base it on Ontario legislative tradition first, then the House of Commons, and so on.

We do have the precedent of Mr. McKeough who felt very keenly ministerial responsibility for his actions and those of the people in his ministry. I thought at the time he should not

have resigned on that occasion. I am not sure I feel much differently this time, except for that precedent set by Mr. McKeough and the Treasurer's own words. He obviously felt the traditions and usages of this Legislature required that he resign. Be that as it may, the Treasurer obviously is well liked in this chamber. He seems to be a decent, honourable and honest man and it is unfortunate that he of all people should come to this pass. I think it was evident on Friday, particularly, that he was having a great many personal problems with the situation as it arose.

Of course, we will see after tomorrow exactly whether what the Globe and Mail had was the original budget. The member for York South (Mr. Rae) has put it as neatly as it can possibly be put. What has happened, in effect, in this dialogue in the last few days is that the Treasurer decides what a budget is and when it is his budget. Obviously, that can cover a multitude of sins because, presumably, he could change his mind as he walks into this chamber. He could say, "All that printed stuff you have on your desk is really not the budget. It is a bit of a joke, a little more sophisticated than my comic book, but basically here is the budget in my breast pocket."

Somewhat irrelevantly, I thought all the time the Treasurer had at least two budgets: one if the Premier (Mr. Davis) ran for the federal leadership and one if he did not. There may actually even be four budgets: one if the Treasurer was going to run for the provincial leadership and one if he did not. There may be four budgets in those garbage bags.

The other part of this motion that endears it to me personally is that I think it would be most appropriate to have the procedural affairs committee look into this whole matter and call before it those people at the Globe and Mail who, first, sanctioned this kind of thing and, second, allowed its publication. I realize the press is sacrosanct, and it often occurs to me that if politicians have large egos, those in the media make us look like pikers in comparison.

There is a sense I got in my constituency and from others I have spoken to of moral outrage at the actions of the Globe and Mail in this respect. Some of my colleagues and I were also recipients of this kind of journalism a few years ago when we were on a select committee. None of us objected in any way to a reporter from the Globe and Mail going down and looking at the receipts for our hotel rooms and making a big

story about the fact that there we were in Florida and it was 40 below in Ontario.

Nobody objected to that—it was part of the game—but what I objected to was that this particular reporter got in a taxi and followed us around. Fortunately, she happened to follow the right taxi because she followed me and I was on a tour of various old and architecturally interesting churches in the Miami area. I just thought it was stooping a little low to be doing that kind of thing. As the Treasurer himself said, "You have to be stooping pretty low when you go through garbage bags."

That particular reporter was—banished is not, I think, a fair word, but shall we say, she was transferred shortly after that for whatever reason. There seems to be some kind of strange morality going on in here in terms of what this particular newspaper sees fit to print and the way it sees fit to get that news. I would think perhaps a dialogue on the morality of the press, which is very fond of lecturing us on our particular morality, would have been a very felicitous outcome of referring this whole matter to the procedural affairs committee.

I would hope that this would go further than this debate today and that the government itself might see fit to refer the matter to the procedural affairs committee.

Hon. Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, I must confess that I did not really think this particular debate would go on today. After they read the verdict of the public on what they did on Friday morning, I really thought the two opposition parties might have agreed that perhaps they overreacted a bit on Thursday night, and with some justification, because the reports on Thursday night and part of Friday morning were rather fragmentary. I do not think it was until some time later on Friday that the full picture of what supposedly occurred became evident.

However, they have decided to proceed. I find it very interesting, particularly regarding the New Democrats, that they are saying they do not want to overreact. In fact, their lead speaker today said, "Let us wait for the budget to see". I believe it was the government and the Treasurer that suggested that on Friday morning and were met with hoots of derision from the far left in the opposition.

What also concerns me is that somehow we are now placed in a position where we want to refer this to the standing committee on procedural affairs. For what? There has been a suggestion that the standing committee on pro-

cedural affairs can begin to play gumshoe with the media.

Whatever the media have done, whatever their ethics are, whatever they have done in the past or whatever they will do in the future, surely is not the particular concern of the committee on procedural affairs unless they are done in this building. What has been done has been done many miles away from here. We are talking about the procedural affairs committee that will look at the budgetary process. Do we in this House really believe that the committee on procedural affairs is really going to look at the budgetary process or is the proper one to do so? Of course, the answer is no.

5:10 p.m.

It has been suggested that the standing committee on procedural affairs will look at something I happen to believe is long overdue, and that is the relevance of this chamber. Once again, with all due respect to the standing committee on procedural affairs, that is a task beyond its ability.

What are we really here for this afternoon? We are here this afternoon simply as an excuse for all the tumult and all the shouting that occurred Friday morning on the basis of reports so fragmentary that the very motion we are discussing, when it was first typed, used the word "disclosure." That is how fragmentary things were. It had to be pencilled in twice as "publication" and initialled. It is initialled.

Mr. Rae: When was it changed?

Hon. Mr. Drea: It was changed right here.

Mr. Rae: When was it changed?

Hon. Mr. Drea: I said on Friday the results were so fragmentary—

Mr. Rae: When was it changed? You don't know when it was changed. You don't know what you are talking about.

Hon. Mr. Drea: I know what I am talking about. I want to read something to the member.

Mr. Foulds: I bet you got that out of a green garbage bag.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Cousens): Order.

Hon. Mr. Drea: As to the very man who says I do not know what I am talking about, let me read what kangaroo court Rae had to say on Friday. Let me read it. "In my view, the Treasurer should do the honourable thing—

Mr. Martel: Isn't that wrong, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Breagh: You can't use that word in here.

The Acting Speaker: The minister will withdraw the statement where he called another member a kangaroo. That is not parliamentary.

Hon. Mr. Drea: I said "kangaroo court."

The Acting Speaker: That is fine. Remove that as well, please.

Hon. Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, I withdraw it but I want to read what Mr. Humanity said: "In my view, the Treasurer should do the honourable thing. He should resign. The matter should then be referred to a committee, and if that committee finds there was the kind of evidence I have suggested might be persuasive, then it is possible for us to look at the Treasurer's position again."

In other words, according to Mr. Humanity, one is guilty until he proves himself innocent. He said it. The member for Wilson Heights (Mr. Rotenberg) was most eloquent in the words he used to describe it.

The suggestion has been made that because of the events in the media the budget has been fundamentally flawed. Let us look at what has happened since Friday morning. If indeed the markets were to be affected, then we need more flaws because on Friday the markets set all-time records. If the farm community wanted to plant over this weekend, and it was because of a flawed budget it did not, I suggest that because of the weather there would not have been very much planting, even going into this afternoon. Certainly, in those terms there was no flaw in the budget.

What we are looking at now, Mr. Speaker, after your own chair has ruled there was no violation of privilege—none whatsoever—and what we are doing is commenting upon whether the Treasurer took the proper security procedures in order that his budget would not be leaked or not go to certain people in terms of their being able to take unfair advantage or make a profit.

The Treasurer has explained it well. He took every reasonable security precaution there was. He is not in the position of some of those who have been mentioned earlier. I want to phrase my words carefully because I do not think Mr. Lalonde should have resigned. I do not think Mr. Lalonde did anything wrong. But in the view of some of those in the past who either made flip remarks or became extremely careless—and Mr. Lalonde is not one of those—in saying that they found themselves in difficulty for revealing a budget, how can one hold a Treasurer or any other minister or any member of this assembly

accountable if someone wishes to steal the garbage? That is why the public has already made up its mind.

The public has indeed made up its mind. It is most sympathetic to the Treasurer; it is not very sympathetic to what is going on here this afternoon. I suggest that should be of more concern to the individual members here than what went on or did not go on last week. When one has an assembly being looked at by the public as something that is not very relevant, then I suggest we have started down a course where alienation between the public and the government becomes a very major concern.

Other than the unfortunate remarks that people are guilty and there should be a committee to see whether they are innocent or re-evaluate their position, what has really happened is that the approach of the modern media towards government—and they do not look at the traditions very carefully—has brought them into rather fundamental conflict with what has been expected and anticipated in the past. That is not something that is going to be solved by a committee, by more security or by more debate in this House. It is something that the media and the ministers themselves may have to take into account in their future course of conduct. It is not something that should be handled here or in a thing that has to end at six o'clock without even a vote.

Mr. Foulds: Mr. Speaker, I want to give my sense of what has developed. It is obviously clear, because neither of the opposition parties challenged the Speaker's ruling this afternoon, that there is no question of privilege. We abided by the Speaker's decision on that matter.

I submit to the government that we do not have here a question of what the public opinion dictates the government should do. This is not a question either of privilege or a question of what the public opinion feels government action should be.

What we have here and what is at stake in our very fragile parliamentary traditions—and our parliamentary traditions are getting more and more fragile as we see the Americanization of the Tory government and of this province—is what this government considers to be its concept of what its ministers are responsible for.

What I resent as a private member, what I believe all members of this House resent and what the public should resent is that the government, like the federal Liberal government, has decided to rewrite its standards in the

middle of the argument. The government's attitude has changed.

Mr. Rotenberg: That is not true.

Mr. Foulds: If the member for Wilson Heights will just listen to me, I will develop that argument for him. First, as many speakers have indicated, the Treasurer did indicate the federal Minister of Finance should have resigned. Second, when confronted by the reporters on Thursday, the Treasurer indicated the documents could ruin his life. That statement has not been denied by the Treasurer.

I submit this indicated the Treasurer believed that ministerial responsibility was at stake, that the tradition of budget secrecy was at stake. Only the next morning did we begin to get the revision of policy of this government and the shift of responsibility.

5:20 p.m.

First, the responsibility was shifted to the Ontario Provincial Police, in the Treasurer's statement. We had written in by hand "part of" to qualify the OPP's responsibility. I found it, quite frankly, disappointing that the Solicitor General (Mr. G. W. Taylor) did not take the 10 minutes available to him to outline to the House what the OPP's responsibility in the budget secrecy process was. We have had none of that information.

Second, there was some attempt to shift the responsibility to Carswell Printing, because the immediate action that the Treasurer took was to remove the printing of the budget from the responsibility of Carswell Printing to the Treasury building, thereby implying that Carswell Printing had not accepted its responsibility.

Finally, there were the very serious allegations made both by implication and explicitly that the Globe and Mail had stolen materials, that theft and trespass were involved. Those are very serious allegations and not one jot of evidence has been brought before this House or before the public to substantiate those serious allegations. I find that, frankly, very disturbing.

The traditional concept of budget secrecy is enunciated very clearly in a number of instances, which I would like to quote. First of all, the Honourable George Nowlan in the House of Commons debates, June 19, 1963, said:

"I do not think the public generally realize the way in which secrecy has always been a traditional part of making a budget; the absolute necessity of avoiding a leak, consciously or unconsciously, and of assuring the public that the Minister of

Finance, like Caesar's wife, is above suspicion." He indicates that this is the prime principle.

"We take the precaution of locking up the press until the Minister of Finance delivers his speech, as today it has an impact on every man and every woman in all walks of life and on all facets of our economy."

In an article on budget secrecy in the Canadian Tax Journal, May 1976, D. J. Sherbaniuk says this, and I quote it because I think it is of some interest:

"The rules of secrecy have several merits and also some disadvantages. Of paramount importance is the necessity to prevent interested parties from profiting by knowledge obtained in advance, and perhaps also to prevent financial speculation and loss of revenue to the exchequer.

"If these evils can be thwarted by withholding information capable of being used for purposes of private gain, there is little reason why the remainder of the budget should not be publicly discussed. Such distinctions have not been made, however, and the veil of secrecy shrouds the entire budget."

I would submit that this government has not made such distinctions until the incident with the Treasurer. Now the total defence of the government rests on the fact that the information that was disclosed could not profit anybody. That is their sole defence at the present moment.

I would submit that what the Treasurer has admitted, what the government has admitted, is that substantial material having to do with the budget has been made public. It is only when caught in that act, whether advertent or inadvertent, that they have resorted to the one defence.

I want to quote Donald S. Macdonald, as Minister of Finance in 1976, from his own budget speech of that year:

"The tradition of budget secrecy has two grounds. It is intended to deny anyone financial advantage from advance information and it is intended to ensure that important statements of government economic policy are disclosed first to the members of the House of Commons. Both of these reasons are valid and important."

I would submit that certainly this second reason has not been abided by in this situation. Those two grounds, if I may say so, were enunciated by our own Speaker this afternoon when he said, "The budget by its very nature must be kept secret until it is presented by the Treasurer in this House. Such a practice is, of course, necessary to prevent financial specula-

tion and the loss of revenue to the government treasury."

We will never know if what was revealed in the budget has resulted in a loss of revenue to the government treasury because the government could be rewriting the budget.

Second, this afternoon the Speaker said, "Budget secrecy is a political convention, as is the practice that the Treasurer presents his budget in the House before discussing it in any other public forum." Certainly we have had our Treasurer and the Premier (Mr. Davis) discussing the budget in a public forum subsequent to Thursday's events—all over the weekend, in fact. I would submit that is a breach of the traditional budgetary secrecy concept.

There is no question public opinion is on the Treasurer's side. However, government by poll is just not good enough in this circumstance. I would have more sympathy for the government and for the Treasurer if this were a government committed to openness—if it were a government committed to freedom of information. But no, this is a government that is committed to neither of those concepts. A number of questions still need to be answered.

Has there been an effort to be open, to be candid? The Treasurer did not make any kind of preliminary statement to the House on Thursday. On Friday morning the Treasurer allowed points of privilege to go on for an hour and a quarter without intervening to indicate to the House publicly that he had a ministerial statement to make.

What is at stake? It would appear the Treasurer has not deliberately leaked the budget. It would appear his officials have not deliberately leaked the budget. But it would appear substantial budget information has become public. That is why our motion calls for the standing committee on procedural affairs to examine the traditional methods surrounding the preparation of the Ontario budget. Second, it asks whether those traditional methods have been properly observed in this case.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Cousens): I thank the honourable member.

Mr. Foulds: I would just like to conclude with this one sentence. The Treasurer indicates to me that he himself considers a serious breach of the traditional parliamentary secrecy surrounding budgets has occurred.

Mr. Riddell: Mr. Speaker, when I arrived at my office this afternoon, there was a message on my desk. I was to make an urgent telephone call

to a farmer in southwestern Ontario who has the respect of many people, not only farmers but urban people down there. He has been closely connected in some way with the Ridgeway College of Agricultural Technology; he has done some lecturing; he has been very prevalent in swine breeding; he has been a farmer for a period of time. He informed me today the bank had called his note. Today was his last day.

I do not know whether or not that is coincidental with the budget which was leaked. I hope not. I do not know how widespread that type of thing might be but it was one thing I raised when we had the debate on Friday. The one real concern I had was that with this budget leak the lending institutions probably were going to take a very tough stand on the farmers. They saw the government was withdrawing what little commitment it had to the farming industry.

Mr. Rotenberg: Why don't you blame the frost over the weekend on the budget leak?

The Acting Speaker: Order.

Mr. Riddell: I will not pursue that any further, but I resent some—

Mr. Rotenberg: I have never heard such nonsense in my life.

Mr. McClellan: Sure you have.

The Acting Speaker: Order.

Mr. Riddell: —incidents which took place since we learned of the budget leak. I want to talk a little bit about that.

When, on Thursday, we learned of the report in the *Globe and Mail*, the Liberal House leader, quite in accordance with the standing orders, moved that the committee rise and report. The chairman, in his wisdom, thought he wanted to think it over for a time and then we all left the chamber. The bells rang for some time. We came back around 11 p.m. and everybody voted in favour of the committee rising and reporting. Then the House leader proceeded to draw to the attention of the Speaker the fact that there had been a budget leak. The Speaker would not even look at him, would not even acknowledge him and of his own volition—but I think he received marching orders from his colleagues—he adjourned the House.

5:30 p.m.

At the adjournment, the member for Mississauga East (Mr. Gregory) put down the greatest—

Hon. Mr. Gregory: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. My friend opposite referred to a decision the Speaker made spurred on by his colleagues. I

wonder if he would like to withdraw that remark or whether he is implying something about the Speaker.

The Acting Speaker: I appreciate the government whip's comment. Certainly the Speaker is not beholden to any one party as the member was inclined to say there. Could you withdraw that remark?

Mr. Riddell: The Speaker was not long in making up his mind that he was going to adjourn the House. If he did that of his own volition, then fine, I withdraw it.

Upon the adjournment of the House, the member for Mississauga East put on the greatest outward display of vulgarity I have ever seen in this House, unbecoming to a member who holds two or three portfolios and collects two or three salaries. He not only gave my colleague the upward mobile finger once; he did it about six times. At the adjournment, and after I saw him do that, my teacher's instinct was to go over there and to reprimand him for using that kind of vulgarity in this House. When he saw there were sufficient of his own colleagues mustering around him to give him a defence, he then gave me the finger. Like any fair, judicial parent, I exercised the authority I would have done with my own son.

The next time that happens, I will not only give the member a verbal spanking. I will turn him over my knee. When I am done—

Hon. Mr. Gregory: I suspect the member did not exactly know what he was doing the other night, but I assure him, if he tries it again, it will not be as easy as he thought it was going to be.

The Acting Speaker: I would ask the member to speak to the motion that is before us.

Interjections.

Mr. Riddell: Time is wearing on, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker: Order.

Mr. Riddell: Then we entered into the various points of privilege on Friday morning. The point I was trying to make at the time was that, as elected members of this Legislature, we are asked to react and respond to and represent nine million people outside of this Legislature to the best of our ability and to dispel any suspicions they might have.

I tried to raise with the Premier (Mr. Davis) the fact that a number of suspicions had been drawn to my attention as to what his involvement might have been with the budget. He got up and launched an attack, which he is quite capable of doing, for whatever reasons I have no idea. All I

asked him to do was to say there was absolutely nothing to the suspicions I raised with him, but he did not want to do that. He wanted to launch an attack on me and I am getting a little tired of this.

I ask every member to go back to 1975 and read in Hansard the attack he launched on the House leader of this party after the 1975 election. I ask them to take a look at the attack he made on the former leader of this party. The Premier basks in the glory of wounding his enemies, but when he is the least bit wounded he squeals like a stuck pig.

Mr. Bradley: Oh, no, that's different then.

Mr. Riddell: It is different. When the Premier indicated I would regret what I said, I want the message to be carried to the Premier that I do not threaten easily. I am one who will see he continues to squeal until he feels there is some fairness in this place. If he is prepared to dish it out, he had better be prepared to take it. He is going to have to take it as long as I am a member of this Legislature.

Not only do I think the Treasurer should resign, I am not going to talk too much about the Treasurer, but the man who holds two or three portfolios, the member for Mississauga East who collects two or three salaries, should resign as well for the display of vulgarity he used in this House.

Mr. Gillies: Mr. Speaker, I will not by any means say I am pleased to join this debate. I am not pleased to join it because as I have observed this debate unfold through the last two hours I have been extremely disappointed in the tone and direction it has taken. I suggest it is just shy of a perversion of democracy that it took place. This has been one of the worst wastes of time I have observed in some two years in this House.

If I might make reference to the last speaker's 10 minutes. I believe at the four-minute mark on our new electronic timing device in this place, he finally got on to a subject other than whether he wished to inflict physical damage on the chief government whip. I do not think that six minutes of this House's time was well used by that discussion.

I have listened to some articulate speeches in this House, often by the member for Scarborough West (Mr. R. F. Johnston), about the relevance of this assembly. After the events of last Friday when I went back to my riding for the weekend, I sensed that the debate that took place and the various points of privilege and order in which we indulged at such length did

not do anything to remove the feeling from the public's mind that this place is becoming irrelevant.

The average person I spoke to thought it was ridiculous even to suggest the Treasurer should resign over the so-called leak. The people I spoke to also thought that what we were engaged in was just so much parliamentary game-playing and that it had little to do with their everyday lives and their aspirations.

Mr. Martel: Except the Treasurer thought it was okay.

Mr. McClellan: Might open up a job for you.

Mr. Martel: What did he say, Phil?

Mr. McClellan: Come on, you know you need a job.

Mr. Martel: What did the Treasurer say, Phil?

The Acting Speaker: Order.

Mr. Gillies: If the member for Sudbury East (Mr. Martel) does not mind, I listened very attentively to the arguments being developed on his side of the floor and I would appreciate the same courtesy.

When the deputy leader of the New Democratic Party started his speech, he made a quote with which I take some exception. He said what we are engaged in here, and I am paraphrasing, is neither a question of public opinion nor privilege. I suggest it is very much a question of both. If we are concerned about the relevance of this Legislature and the work we do, we have to be concerned about what the people back home are telling us and how they perceive what we are doing. My perception is the people of the province are looking at this current situation in a less than favourable light. If they are even aware this debate is taking place, and I doubt that 90 per cent of them are, I am sure they think it irrelevant.

Mr. Bradley: They never will know without television in the House.

Mr. Gillies: They never will know, I suggest to the member, because the debate is irrelevant and a waste of the time of this assembly.

I can appreciate the sense of embarrassment now being expressed by many of the media outlets in the province over the activities of last Friday. Yet I detect no embarrassment from the members opposite for the way they conducted themselves on Friday morning.

5:40 p.m.

Interjections.

The Acting Speaker: Order.

Mr. Gillies: The question is not whether the Treasurer has conducted his duties in the way we would expect him to. As far as I am concerned, the question is whether the tactics exercised by one of the major media of this province were ethical and whether they did the fourth estate any justice at all. The outpouring by various columnists and commentators is considerable.

Interjections.

Mr. Gillies: Let me quote to the members.

The Acting Speaker: Order. I ask the honourable members to stop interrupting other speakers.

Mr. Gillies: I would appreciate just a little consideration over there, if the members do not mind.

If one wishes to draw a distinction between what happened to Mr. Lalonde and what happened in this city last week, one has to look no further than the editorial by the newspaper that was most directly involved in this matter, the *Globe and Mail*. Let me quote from the editorial in today's *Globe and Mail*:

"Should Mr. Miller resign? No, he should not. To do so would be to exaggerate grossly his responsibility for last week's leak of information. Mr. Miller was right when he called for Mr. Lalonde's resignation, for the federal finance minister was clearly the author of his own misfortune."

That same editorial, in the *Globe and Mail* of all places, goes on to say: "Mr. Miller's case is different. It was not through his own negligence, nor that of members of his staff, that the security of Ontario's budget was breached." There is a very clear distinction between the two cases.

The Minister of Community and Social Services said in his usual nonprovocative manner a few minutes ago that he is a little surprised this debate is even taking place. I must admit I am too. I would have thought, after Thursday night, the members of Her Majesty's official opposition really thought they were on to something pretty good and said: "Let's embarrass the heck out of the Treasurer. Let's have fun with this." By Friday morning, surely they could see what was coming out.

Interjections.

The Acting Speaker: Order.

Mr. Gillies: The public is very well aware that what we saw was intemperate posturing. What we were seeing was no more than political game-playing and, if they pursued it too far, the thing was going to turn bad on them. It has turned bad on them, because the public is not at

all on their side of the issue and neither are responsible observers from the media themselves.

Interjection.

The Acting Speaker: I tell the honourable member on my immediate left that further interjections will cause some serious decisions to be taken by the chair.

Mr. Gillies: Actually, I wish the leader of the third party was not interjecting, because I was just about to say that perhaps the only positive thing to come out of this debate might be the contention by certain members of the House, including the leader of the third party, that the budget process itself should be reviewed. Perhaps the budget process itself is a little outmoded. If it has existed in its current form for so long—

Mr. Martel: That is what the resolution says.

Mr. Gillies: Yes, I am well aware of that. I am getting to that. If it has existed as it has and it is now necessary for somebody to get a story, to get a scoop, to go to the lengths they did last week to try to frustrate the process as it exists, then perhaps change is needed. But that will not arise out of this debate, as members opposite are fully aware. That will not arise out of the rather ridiculous and, I suggest, intemperate posturing that was going on last Friday. That will come out of a careful and considered re-evaluation of the process as it exists and any positive suggestions for reform that might come forward.

I was very disappointed, and I say this most sincerely, to see the direction the discussions in this House took on Friday last. I was very disappointed to see members of the opposition rising and baiting the Treasurer to speak when they knew darned well he had a statement in hand and he would be making it when the time for ministerial statements was reached. I thought that was just a bit much.

The Treasurer rose at the earliest opportunity, under the rules of this House, to make his statement. His statement helped to clear the air on his perception of his responsibility, which is unquestioned. And the Treasurer is standing behind his budget and behind the process, and he assumes personal responsibility for what is going on. There is no question there.

Hon. Mr. Gregory: They didn't want to hear his statement.

Mr. Gillies: The chief government whip is quite correct; perhaps what we were seeing on Friday was a situation not where the members of the House really wanted to be informed as to the

government's thoughts but where they really wanted to score some points while they thought the going was good.

The Treasurer should not resign. The budget should be brought down tomorrow at four o'clock. It should not be changed, in my opinion, because of what happened last week. The Treasurer has fulfilled his responsibilities, and the next step in his responsibilities is to bring that budget into the House tomorrow so we can see it through to reality by the usual procedures.

This debate is not a good use of the Legislature's time. Nor is it a good use of the public's time and money that we should indulge in this situation where we have a motion too little, too late to talk about a matter that the members of the opposition already appreciate has been adjudicated by the public will.

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, I want to focus my remarks this afternoon on one basic issue, which is that something happened in the last few days that has caused all of us to reflect on the nature of two things: first, the nature of the budgetary process and the importance of budget secrecy, and second, the question of ministerial responsibility and accountability to this Legislature.

Those are the two issues, and after all the smoke has cleared, after all the personalities have been dealt with and stuff has been thrown back and forth across the floor of this Legislature, those are the issues that are still going to be here once this controversy is over.

The purpose of this resolution, which was drafted on Thursday night, is not to focus the attention of the Legislature on the question of whether the minister should resign or on the nature of all sorts of things going back and forth or on what was or was not left in garbage bags or on what is journalistic ethics and what is not; that is not the question. The questions are: What is budget secrecy and why is it important? What is the nature of ministerial responsibility and why is that important?

I have not heard a convincing statement from anybody who has spoken this afternoon for the government side as to why this matter should not be considered by the standing committee on procedural affairs. They are choosing once again to hide behind their majority, just as I have seen Liberal majorities do in Ottawa time and time again: the same technique, the same tactic in an attempt to deny the rights of all the members of the Legislature the opportunity to devise a set of rules that are appropriate for the last quarter of the 20th century.

It may well be that the rules and regulations with respect to budget secrecy, which have been called into question on several occasions not only in this Legislature but also in other Legislatures and, indeed, in the House of Commons in Ottawa, need to be changed.

What is happening is that those rules are being changed. But are they being changed by a process of consideration and by due process? Are they being changed through consideration by the standing committee on procedural affairs or a similar committee in this Legislature? No. They are being changed by the majority.

In Ottawa the Liberals say: "What Marc Lalonde did was not wrong. It is a problem of the Hamilton station that had the zoom lens. Anyway, it is not really a budget leak, because we can change the numbers." So we have got a totally movable feast: the budget on Thursday is not the budget on Friday and it is not the same budget on Monday; and with the snap of Marc Lalonde's fingers we can get a new budget. So you have never got a problem of a budget leak.

I do not think majorities should be able to get away with that kind of thing. I do not care whether it is a Liberal majority, a Conservative majority or, I would say, a New Democratic Party majority. I do not think this is the kind of thing that majorities should be able to do. We do not make rules in this place and we do not build traditions simply on the basis of whatever a majority decides happens to be right; nor, with great respect for the member for Brantford (Mr. Gillies), do we decide it on the basis of what a Globe and Mail editorial happens to be on one day. What in heaven's name kind of standard is that?

5:50 p.m.

We had the Solicitor General getting up, giving a speech and, instead of telling us what his responsibilities are in this regard, making a 10-minute attack on the Globe and Mail newspaper. Then we had the member from Brantford standing up and saying, "The standard we should follow is the standard found in the editorial pages of the Globe and Mail."

Mr. Rotenberg: You quote editorials.

Mr. Rae: That is not the way this place should be run; nor, I say with respect to the member for Wilson Heights, whose voice would charm the gods whenever we hear it, is it up to us to go back to the public, put our finger up in the air, see who blows on it over the weekend, and come back and say: "The new rule with respect to budget secrecy is that it is not a problem if it is

left outside in a green garbage bag and a reporter comes along and picks it up. That is not a leak and is not something for which the minister can be held accountable."

I think the question that has to be dealt with by the standing committee on procedural affairs is very simple and basic. It is a question that must indeed be dealt with. There has to be consideration by the committee as to what happened, and there has to be consideration as to the nature of ministerial responsibility when that happens.

There are ample precedents. They have not been mentioned in this House because we have been so preoccupied with the Dalton example with respect to budget secrecy when he, on the way in to read the budget, gave an account of one measure to a reporter who then went off and the edition came out. There was definitely a leak on his part.

Our focus on that has ignored another problem, the question of what is the accountability or the responsibility of a minister in this place when the bureaucratic process breaks down. The theory we have been operating under—I say "we," and I mean it in terms of all the members of the House who are all permanent students of constitutional law and the constitutional life of this place—is that there is a theory almost of strict liability with respect to budget secrecy.

One can say that theory has been observed more in the breach than in the observance. If one looked at the examples of the number of ministers in majority governments who have resigned because of mistakes made by their civil servants, one would find precious few. I often observe, if one looks at majorities, it takes an awful lot to get ministers to resign.

A great deal can happen. Attorneys General can have meetings with wealthy individuals, whose companies are subject to a criminal investigation, and that apparently is not cause for resignation. I must say I find it a rather bizarre notion that anybody in the middle of a criminal investigation can call up the Attorney General and in the space of 24 hours get an appointment. I find that a little strange.

There are a great many of my constituents to whom that same rule would not apply. There are countless situations I can think of where, again, the civil service or the bureaucracy has broken down, where things have been done and where mistakes have been made for which ministers no longer feel responsible.

The Sir Thomas Dugdale example is the

British example in 1954 where a minister did feel that. The Darcy McKeough example is an example in this Legislature where a minister did feel he had to take personal responsibility for what appeared to be a mistake that had been allowed to pass by his own civil service.

Why is the principle of accountability and responsibility important? It is important in a democracy because, unless we can hold someone in this assembly accountable, one has government by no one and nobody. One has a democracy that is incapable of holding anybody responsible for things that are done and things that are not done. One has bureaucrats in a democracy who in a sense are responsible to nobody and accountable to nobody.

In the events that occurred, I am not satisfied. I know it may not be the most popular opinion to express in the world, but I simply have to say it. I am not satisfied when we are simply told it is the responsibility of a printing company with which we have a contract.

I am not satisfied, quite frankly, that we are getting the information we need. I am not satisfied with any piece of evidence put before me that I or a member of our party on the standing committee on procedural affairs cannot have an opportunity to cross-examine. Surely we are entitled to do that.

Surely as a committee we are entitled to ask the individuals involved what happened. While it may not be a matter of privilege, and while it apparently is not a matter the minister or the Premier feels is sufficiently important for the minister to resign, it is, in our view, a matter that has to be considered by some group in this Legislature.

If we do not do that, if we simply say, "You guys all overreacted; this is really a tempest in a teapot; the real question is journalistic ethics," we will be missing the basic point: if we throw out the doctrine of ministerial accountability and responsibility in this Legislature, what are we replacing it with?

If government information can leak out and if we are not being allowed to cross-examine as to exactly how it happened, but have to rely on accounts in a newspaper, what kind of democracy do we have? If we are not allowed to reach for those questions, then our democracy will be all the poorer.

That is why I think this motion deserves to carry. I hope the government will see fit to move a vote today. If it does not, I hope it will see fit to have this matter considered by the committee in order that the question of responsibility and

accountability of ministers of the crown can be considered at length by this assembly.

Mr. McGuigan: Mr. Speaker, like other speakers, I am not happy to join in this debate. However, I cannot help but observe that it is not right to attempt to put the focus on the newspapers, as one speaker did, as despicable as all of us might see that rummaging in the garbage.

Is this assembly really telling me that it is trying to defend secrets worth millions of dollars—perhaps billions—being set out on the side of the road and that no one has the responsibility for those secrets being out there? Is it telling me they should remain in that garbage bag until it goes to the landfill site where they are picked up by the winds and blown who knows where?

Is that the kind of responsibility this government thinks is a defensible responsibility? To put it out in the garbage and let it blow in the wind? Perhaps it will walk on to a stockbroker's desk and only then will somebody take responsibility for it. But if it gets to the landfill and is buried, if no one happens to notice it, if no one happens to stumble upon it, then there is no responsibility and this government is safe. Is that the argument the government is trying to make?

This afternoon and over the weekend, when I was talking to farmers, I learned that the sheriff will be going to a farmer's house tomorrow morning to seize his goods. He is going to put the man out on the side of the road. He was asking me what I could do. I talked to the banker. I know this is not a one-sided story—it is not all the fault of the banker—and that there have been mistakes made.

One thing this man was asking for was a

writedown in some of his debts. When this farm is sold, there will be a writedown in any event. Anybody can forecast that, because in the present market, with farm values going down, there is going to be a loss and there will be a writedown that day. But the bank says: "No, it is against the principles of the bank to operate that way. Our principle is that one must repay that debt, and if one cannot repay it, he is out on the road." That is the high principle they operate by. But the chief banker of Ontario does not work by high principle.

I am not saying he is a crook or anything of that sort. No one is suggesting that. But his place is to maintain the relevancy that people are talking about. I keep hearing day after day that there is no relevancy to this place. The reason there is no relevancy is that the members do not give it the respect to make it relevant. The members do not make it relevant.

It would have been a simple thing for the Treasurer to come in that night and lay his cards on the table for us. We are all fair-minded people. In the heat of things there is the business of going for the jugular, but we are pretty fair-minded people. If he had come here, he would have got fair treatment. Instead of that, we find all sorts of press releases, all sorts of references to editorials and so on. If we are going to make parliament relevant, it is the people here who are going to do it, and they have to face up to the facts of life.

The Acting Speaker: It being six of the clock, this debate is deemed to be concluded under section 34(b) of the standing orders.

The House adjourned at 6 p.m.

CONTENTS

Monday, May 9, 1983

Statements by the ministry

Drea, Hon. F., Minister of Community and Social Services:

Kentucky Derby. 572

Day Nurseries Act revisions. 573

Miller, Hon. F. S., Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics:

Budget. 575

Oral questions

Bennett, Hon. C. F., Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing:

Role of civil servant, Mr. Epp, Mr. Breagh. 582

Davis, Hon. W. G., Premier:

Budget incentives, Mr. Rae, Mr. T. P. Reid. 578

Elgie, Hon. R. G., Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations:

Trust companies, Mr. Breithaupt, Mr. Cassidy. 577

Henderson, Hon. L. C., Provincial Secretary for Resources Development:

Ontario Veterinary College, Mr. Worton, Mr. Swart. 581

Miller, Hon. F. S., Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics:

Budgetary process, Mr. Peterson, Mr. Cooke, Mr. T. P. Reid. 575

Unemployment, Mr. Cooke, Mr. Mackenzie. 583

Unemployment in tourism industry, Mr. Eakins, Mr. Kerrio. 584

Ramsay, Hon. R. H., Minister of Labour:

Stelco emissions, Mr. Mackenzie. 582

Borg-Warner, Mr. Wrye. 586

Stephenson, Hon. B. M., Minister of Education and Minister of Colleges and Universities:

Foreign student fees, Mr. Allen. 585

Walker, Hon. G. W., Minister of Industry and Trade:

Massey-Ferguson, Mr. Rae, Mr. Sweeney. 580

Motion

Committee substitutions, Mr. Wells, agreed to. 586

First readings

Star of Progress Spiritual Church Act, Bill Pr23, Ms. Fish, agreed to. 587

Labour Relations Amendment Act, Bill 31, Mr. Haggerty, agreed to. 587

Private member's motion

Motion to set aside ordinary business, Mr. Rae, Mr. Conway, Mr. Wells, agreed to. 587

Budget security, Mr. Cooke, Mr. Conway, Mr. Wells, Mr. McClellan, Mr. Nixon, Mr. G. W. Taylor, Mr. Martel, Mr. T. P. Reid, Mr. Drea, Mr. Foulds, Mr. Riddell, Mr. Gillies, Mr. Rae, Mr. McGuigan. 589

Other business

Questions to Ministry of Education, Mr. Foulds.	571
Commission on Election Contributions and Expenses, Mr. Speaker.	571
Members' privileges, Mr. Speaker.	571
Visitors, Mr. Speaker.	572
Visitor, Mr. Speaker.	578
Response to written questions, Mr. McClellan.	587
Adjournment.	612

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Allen, R. (Hamilton West NDP)
 Bennett, Hon. C. F., Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Ottawa South PC)
 Bradley, J. J. (St. Catharines L)
 Breagh, M. J. (Oshawa NDP)
 Breithaupt, J. R. (Kitchener L)
 Cassidy, M. (Ottawa Centre NDP)
 Conway, S. G. (Renfrew North L)
 Cooke, D. S. (Windsor-Riverside NDP)
 Cousens, D., Deputy Chairman and Acting Speaker (York Centre PC)
 Cunningham, E. G. (Wentworth North L)
 Davis, Hon. W. G., Premier (Brampton PC)
 Drea, Hon. F., Minister of Community and Social Services (Scarborough Centre PC)
 Eakins, J. F. (Victoria-Haliburton L)
 Elgie, Hon. R. G., Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations
 Epp, H. A. (Waterloo North L)
 Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP)
 Gillies, P. A. (Brantford PC)
 Gregory, Hon. M. E. C., Minister without Portfolio (Mississauga East PC)
 Haggerty, R. (Erie L)
 Henderson, Hon. L. C., Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Lambton PC)
 Kerrio, V. G. (Niagara Falls L)
 Kolyn, A. (Lakeshore PC)
 Laughren, F. (Nickel Belt NDP)
 Mackenzie, R. W. (Hamilton East NDP)
 Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
 McClellan, R. A. (Bellwoods NDP)
 McGuigan, J. F. (Kent-Elgin L)
 Miller, Hon. F. S., Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics (Muskoka PC)
 Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
 Peterson, D. R. (London Centre L)
 Rae, R. K. (York South NDP)
 Ramsay, Hon. R. H., Minister of Labour (Sault Ste. Marie PC)
 Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L-Lab.)
 Riddell, J. K. (Huron-Middlesex L)
 Rotenberg, D. (Wilson Heights PC)
 Stephenson, Hon. B. M., Minister of Education and Minister of Colleges and Universities (York Mills PC)
 Swart, M. L. (Welland-Thorold NDP)
 Sweeney, J. (Kitchener-Wilmot L)
 Taylor, Hon. G. W., Solicitor General (Simcoe Centre PC)
 Turner, Hon. J. M., Speaker (Peterborough PC)
 Walker, Hon. G. W., Minister of Industry and Trade (London South PC)
 Wells, Hon. T. L., Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Scarborough North PC)
 Worton, H. (Wellington South L)
 Wrye, W.M. (Windsor-Sandwich L)



Hansard

Official Report of Debates

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Third Session, 32nd Parliament
Tuesday, May 10, 1983

Speaker: Honourable John M. Turner
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

Contents of the proceedings reported in this issue of Hansard appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of the speakers taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is \$15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service Information Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street Toronto, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 965-2238.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Tuesday, May 10, 1983

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

ORAL QUESTIONS

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Provincial Secretary for Justice with respect to freedom of information. Since that topic was not considered in the speech from the throne for this year, can the minister tell us whether the government will be introducing in the House during this session a bill on freedom of information and protection of individual privacy?

Mr. Roy: Don't get carried away, now. Just drop it on us gently.

Hon. G. W. Taylor: Run out the clock, Norm; you've got an hour.

Hon. Mr. Sterling: Mr. Speaker, I am getting a lot of advice this afternoon, as you can well appreciate.

Mr. Speaker: I can see that.

Hon. Mr. Sterling: Mr. Speaker, the position of the government is no different from the one I indicated about two or three months ago: that the matter is still under consideration and that it was not included either in this year's speech from the throne or in that of 1982. I am still optimistic, however, that we are progressing on the matter—we still consider it of an important nature—and that some of the commitments that have been made in the past will come to fruition.

Mr. Breithaupt: While the minister is progressing conservatively, it would appear that since it has been six years since the Williams commission was appointed and three years since it reported; since we have spent over \$3 million in the acquisition of expertise on this subject, which is second to none anywhere in the world, and since we in the opposition have been able, as the minister is aware from my Bill 6, to put together a freedom of information bill generally based upon the principles of the Williams commission, what is he going to provide us with in so far as a resolution of this subject is concerned? How much more expertise is needed? Why can we not be guaranteed

that we will have a bill on this subject, at least for discussion purposes, so that the matter can proceed?

Hon. Mr. Sterling: I agree there has been a great deal of study and expertise put into this matter; I agree there is no need for any further expertise. In fact, I have a draft bill that is being considered by the cabinet at this time, but all the matters relating to the various sections have not been resolved among the cabinet ministers. Until that is resolved, the matter cannot be brought forward to the public.

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Speaker, given the pronouncements made in this House on sessional paper 115, I think in October 1981 by the minister's colleague, the member for Cochrane South (Mr. Pope); given the fact that at that time he stated, by way of a letter from the Premier (Mr. Davis) that was distributed to every ministry of the government, that the previous position of the government was to have openness and a frank exchange, not only with members of the Legislature but with members of the press and public generally; and given the fact that we already have had civil servants fired for following those guidelines; when is the minister going to come in with clear and unequivocal legislation that will, in essence, practise the freedom of information that he talks about so proudly behind closed doors?

Hon. Mr. Sterling: Mr. Speaker, I do believe we have a very open government. In fact, we have taken a number of steps in terms of improving the access to information in our government: Each ministry has a library; we have produced a catalogue of the various documents we have in our government; in December 1981 I produced a document outlining all the personal data banks we have in government.

I must also point out that I receive very few queries from the public relating to the lack of provision of information about government programs. I do receive the odd request for information from an individual about another individual. Of course, those particular documents are sometimes kept confidential for the protection of privacy.

CONSTITUTIONAL ACCORD

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the

Premier (Mr. Davis) I would like to ask a question of the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs who, I think, represents this province on the Constitution. I would have liked to have asked the question of the Premier, but it is in that particular minister's area.

A few days ago, when the Premier was still a candidate for the federal Tory leadership, he made a speech at the Canadian Club. He was talking about relationships between certain provinces and how he would work for the unity of the country. One of the things he said about Quebec was, "I am certainly prepared to advance a position on behalf of the government of Ontario that will take into account some of the genuine concerns that are felt within our sister province."

Will the minister advise us exactly what the Premier was talking about? What new position is the Premier prepared to take or advance on behalf of this province to accommodate the concerns of Quebec on the Constitution?

2:10 p.m.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, as I recall, I answered that question a couple of weeks ago. As a matter of fact, it was asked the same day the Premier made the speech.

I think I indicated at the time that the Premier was expressing the general opinion of this government, which has always been put forward by the members of this government, that we felt first of all very sorry that the province of Quebec—or, more particularly, the government of Quebec—had not accepted the Canada Act, had not signed the Constitution and did not feel it could embrace the new Constitution of Canada.

I also drew attention to the fact that, notwithstanding the fact it does not embrace the Constitution, those sections of the Constitution that cannot be obliterated from that province by the "notwithstanding" clause apply, of course, in Quebec, although we do know it has already used the "notwithstanding" clause in certain legislation, so that the Constitution of Canada would not govern the legislation Quebec used to put the teachers back to work, as I recall.

But the position of this government has always been that we would be willing to sit down and discuss with Quebec those things that would make the Constitution of Canada more acceptable to it. One of the things it has put forward, if the honourable member wants to talk about specifics, is full fiscal compensation for opting out. That is a position that several times we have privately said to them—and I mentioned this in the House the last time when the speech was

made—we would be willing to sit down and discuss with them if that was what they wished to do and if it was one of those things that could help build bridges between this province and Quebec.

The Premier may have had some other things in mind. The member will have to ask him about those.

Mr. Roy: I would have thought that when the Premier was advancing a new position dealing with intergovernmental affairs, his minister in charge would have known what the Premier was talking about.

But let me be more specific. On fiscal compensation for opting out, does the minister agree with the position, for instance, of Joe Clark, who feels they should give some compensation at some time; or the position of Brian Mulroney, another federal leadership candidate, who says they should not?

Which position does the minister take on the right of veto for Quebec? Is he on the side of his friend to his left, the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry), who says Quebec should have limited veto rights in the area of culture and language; or does he agree with the gentleman on his right, the Premier, who slapped him down when he brought forward that position? Can he advise us exactly where he is on this issue?

Hon. Mr. Wells: First of all, I am not going to offer any comments on the positions of the various contenders for the leadership of the federal Progressive Conservative Party. They will have to speak for themselves on those issues, just as we will speak for ourselves here.

I have indicated to the honourable member that this province is willing to sit down and talk to the government of Quebec about any of those things it feels would help bring it into the Constitution of Canada. This means accepting the fact that this is a country and that we want all provinces to stay together and so forth, and not accepting the basic premise they have that they might rather want to stress those things that would allow them to separate.

But if there are things that will help them accept the Constitution, we will sit down and discuss those things. One of those things is full fiscal compensation; there may be others. My friend the Attorney General was putting out another suggestion, a suggestion a little different but perhaps, if you studied them, not really very much different from full fiscal compensation.

The real point is that it is not the specifics we are talking about; it is building the bridges and

sitting down and talking about some of those things that will not compromise the positions and principles of this government but will help build better relations with Quebec and bring it into the total constitutional fold.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, since the government is now declaring its willingness to be flexible and to find ways by which Quebec might be persuaded to re-enter the question of constitutional negotiations, could the minister comment on Ontario's readiness with respect to French-language rights in Ontario?

Now that the government has formally declared the right to education in French should be a right for any Franco-Ontarian, is the government also prepared, given its flexibility in relation to Quebec, to accept the implications of section 133 and have it apply to Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, we do not have any statement on that principle today. I just draw the member's attention to the fact that, in keeping with the long-standing record of this government, the Minister of Education (Miss Stephenson) has announced new initiatives which go beyond the constitutional guarantee as far as French-language education is concerned.

The Constitution says "where numbers warrant." This government is moving to guarantee everyone who is a francophone in this province the right to choose if he or she wishes to have education in his or her mother tongue.

Mr. Roy: May I just say to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs that, when he talks about building bridges between Quebec and Ontario, we agree with that. It would be helpful if the people of Quebec knew exactly what position the government had, rather than a position of the Attorney General one day and that of the Premier the next. It would be important to have a unified voice. The minister understands it is important there should not just be specific positions on specific issues.

I think the question asked by my colleague the member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy) has a lot of merit. Very troubling statistics have come out involving the assimilation of francophones outside Quebec, and the latest statistics I think indicate some 30,000 were assimilated during the last 10 years. In view of this situation and in view of the initiative he took while we thought the Premier was still a candidate for the federal Tory leadership when he made a statement—

Interjection.

Mr. Roy: Did I wake up the member? I am sorry. I promise not to do it again.

Mr. Rotenberg: Ask your question.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Question, please.

Mr. Roy: I woke up more than one there. I am making progress.

Given that troubling statistic and the minister's latest statement about francophone education, does he not think it is time he stepped in on situations such as Mattawa and Iroquois Falls and spoke to his colleague the Minister of Education, to get her going to put that important principle into practice about French-language education for those areas?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I think I just answered the education question. If the member reads the statement, he will see the progress the minister is making in that area—very significant progress which goes beyond the constitutional guarantee.

In regard to section 133, I might ask my friend a question. I recall that about two years ago when we were in the midst of an election campaign the then leader of his party, Stuart Smith, indicated section 133 was not applied to Ontario in the Constitution of Canada because he asked the Prime Minister of Canada not to do that.

DIESEL EMISSIONS

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour concerning the Canadian Salt Co. Ojibway mine near Windsor. Is the minister aware that since 1963 the miners have complained of exhaust fumes, and is he further aware that in 1977 there was a walkout because of excessive fumes and they were promised a program to improve conditions?

In 1977 a test by the Ministry of Labour showed the benzene-soluble portion of the diesel exhaust particulate to be higher than the United States Occupational Safety and Health Administration standard for coke ovens. In January 1978 the union complained to Peter McCrodan because of the excessive smoke and the absenteeism due to that. In February 1978 the ministry said there was no problem except it had concerns about the high levels of nitrogen oxide.

With all these concerns having been expressed by the miners for some 15 or 18 years now, what is the minister prepared to do to ensure we do not have another cinnering plant situation such as Copper Cliff, where 100 people have now died of cancer, or the Elliot Lake situation

where literally dozens of men have died from cancer?

2:20 p.m.

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, I am aware of some of the history the honourable member has brought forward. I must admit I am not completely familiar with all the history, and I am not familiar with where the situation stands at the present time. I will be happy to make myself completely familiar with it and follow up. If any further investigation has to be done, I will make sure it is done.

Mr. Martel: Is the minister aware of a survey taken by the union, not very scientific but none the less taken, which indicated mine workers suffered severe headaches, unusual tiredness, coughing, chest pains, and throat and eye irritation, and, of most concern, in which 78 per cent of those who responded stated they were coughing up black sputum? I want to show the minister a filter after eight hours on surface, this is a filter after three hours underground, and this is a filter after five hours underground. I am sure the minister agrees that is intolerable.

If these filters do not give 100 per cent protection from breathing in fumes and taking in particulate matter, and it is obvious they do not, and if the miners cannot wear the Darth Vader type of hood they are being forced to wear, what measures is the minister prepared to take to ensure the ventilation is such that the miners will not be subjected to breathing in this kind of air?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: I do not want to be provocative because I know the member is very serious about this matter, as well he should be and well I should be too. I am wondering if this is not a matter that arose at the time of his task force, and if it was, why it is only being brought to my attention now. If he had brought it to me three months ago when he was conducting the task force, I could have already been at work on it.

Mr. Wildman: Mr. Speaker, is the minister aware that in 1977 the Environmental Protection Agency announced that preliminary studies showed the diesel exhaust fumes were mutagenic? Is he concerned about that? If that is the case, is he prepared to take action similar to that taken by the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health in the United States, which has demanded further studies on the effects of diesel emissions in mines?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, I believe I answered that question in response to the

original question. The answer is yes, I am prepared to look into it and take whatever action is appropriate.

LEAD ASSESSMENTS AT WILCO-CANADA

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Labour again—and I might suggest to the minister that I obtained those while I was in Windsor last Wednesday—I have a question with respect to Wilco-Canada. Is the minister aware that, in regard to the six charges against the workers for failing to wear proper respirators, these workers were wearing respirators but not the required air-stream helmets? In fact there was only one air-stream helmet available for six workers.

Is the minister further aware that two of his inspectors were in the plant on the days the charges were laid—November 24, November 23 and November 29—yet the inspectors failed to mention to the workers that they were wearing improper respirators. They only found out they were wearing improper respirators on the day on which the charges were laid, which was some five months later.

Will the minister attempt to verify those facts and drop the charges against the workers? Will he also explain to the House why the inspectors did not advise the workers they were wearing improper equipment and why the inspectors did not order proper equipment for them on the spot?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, a similar question, phrased in a different way, was brought forward by the leader of the third party a number of days ago. While I did not make a commitment to him to do so, I made a commitment to myself to look into the matter he was raising. I have been doing that and I am at present in the process of preparing a letter to the leader of the third party giving details of the charges and the reasons for their being laid. I would hope the letter can be delivered tomorrow or the next day.

Mr. Martel: Is the minister aware that as of today there is still inadequate ventilation, no lead control program is in place, workers still have not received training on the alleged assessment and control program, and the control program was posted in only one of five relevant areas?

Is the minister further aware that, effective Friday, his ministry has ordered that respirators be worn in the whole operation and blood level tests be taken weekly? Maybe while the minister is answering, he could tell me why there has been no action up to this time to make that

company comply with required ventilation and, through engineering, eliminate the hazardous conditions?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: I am not going to stand here and defend that company because I am frankly terribly upset with the manner in which it has addressed the matter of occupational health and safety. It has been far from co-operative. We took the ultimate step some time ago of closing it down for a weekend, hoping that would bring it around.

Since then we have had regular inspections and we have laid charges, which is something the member suggested to me time after time. Charges have been laid; I can assure him more charges, if necessary, will be laid. We are determined we are going to bring that particular operation into compliance.

I must admit I have certainly given consideration to closing down that plant. The only thing that has prevented me from doing so is that there is a terrible shortage of jobs in this province and I just do not want to put anybody out of work. But I assure the member if that situation were not prevalent, we would have taken that dramatic action.

Ms. Copps: Mr. Speaker, is the minister then saying he is trading off the issue of worker safety simply to maintain jobs? Is that the tradeoff we are involved in? If it is not, why have charges not been laid vis-à-vis the ventilation problem?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, that is not what I was attempting to imply at all. I was trying to draw attention to the seriousness of the situation and the fact we are attempting to control it and bring the company into line while making sure those jobs remain. I think that is the responsible thing to do in an economic climate such as we have at the present time.

Mr. Martel: Since the company is about to move to St. Marys with a new name, maybe the minister should lay the charges now for improper ventilation and no assessment, before it gets out and everything is swept under the rug.

Will the minister document in the House all the material on those workers who have been on compensation for the last five years? At the same time, will he intervene personally on behalf of at least two of the workers, Brad Tunks and George Pavao, who are still trying to get benefits or retraining from the Workers' Compensation Board since their blood levels are close to 0.50 milligrams, which still allows them to work there, but they are particularly in need of retraining since one of them has severe

nerve damage? Would he intervene personally on behalf of those workers to ensure they get proper retraining?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Yes, I would be pleased to do that if the member will provide me with the information he has.

PSYCHIATRIC SERVICES FOR ADOLESCENTS

Mr. Van Horne: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Health. The mother of a 13-year-old boy who died from glue sniffing three days before Christmas told a coroner's jury in London two weeks ago how she tried for months and failed to get help for her son. Dr. Tim Frewen, who treated the boy, said there was no facility in London for such an adolescent. The boy simply slipped through the loopholes.

Is the minister aware of this coroner's inquest and the recommendations that came from it? Is he prepared to comment on the lack of psychiatric service for adolescents in London, Ontario?
2:30 p.m.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member will have to refer that question to my colleague the Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Drea), who is responsible for psychiatric services for adolescents.

Mr. Van Horne: I am taking a look right now at the press release from Windsor on May 5 and the report of Dr. Heseltine, who has been criss-crossing the province and talking with various medical people and volunteers in the community regarding the proposals he has for psychiatric services within the province. My understanding is that generally this comes under the aegis of the Minister of Health, or at least he is involved in so far as some of these services are offered within a hospital.

Going back to another situation in London last year wherein a parent wrote to the minister about her teenage daughter, who needed some kind of assistance, the understanding came back to those parents that there might be a four- or six-bed unit at Victoria Hospital for the treatment of adolescents. Can the minister or his colleague respond as to why that facility has not yet been placed at Victoria Hospital?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I would like to help the member on those matters, but those matters quite properly, as Dr. Heseltine pointed out, lie at the present time totally within the purview of the Ministry of Community and Social Services. Our ministry, of course, looks after mental

health services for adults, whereas all other mental health services, psychiatric services and related services for adolescents, fall to the Minister of Community and Social Services. The member's question should more properly be addressed to him. Since he is absent, I will refer that to him to respond to the member.

SECURITY OF TENURE IN RENTAL UNITS

Mr. Philip: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney General. He will recall that on April 22 he stated he would be meeting with his colleagues the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Mr. Bennett) and the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Elgie) and that he would make a statement within 10 days about needed amendments to the Landlord and Tenant Act to protect those tenants who are being evicted as a result of the sale of companies to tenancies in common.

Sixteen days have now passed since he made the statement. Can the Attorney General tell us when that statement will be made in the House? Can we also assure the tenants, particularly the large number of those in the Lakeshore area, that legislation will be forthcoming to protect them from being evicted?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, yes, I will be introducing legislation later today to deal effectively, I hope, with the issue the honourable member has raised.

Mr. Philip: That is welcome news. I would like to send the minister eight eviction notices. Many of them relate to tenants who are being evicted on Allanhurst Drive in Lakeshore. Can we have the assurance of the minister that this legislation will be forthcoming in time to prevent their evictions, most of which are dated July 1?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I think this legislation will protect the security of tenure of those tenants. With the co-operation that I think will be forthcoming from our colleagues across the aisle, this legislation could be passed very quickly.

Mr. Kolyn: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege: I would like to correct the record. Allanhurst Drive is not in the Lakeshore area; it is in Humber.

HYDRO CONTRACTS

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Energy. In view of the fact that the people of Ontario have the right to

terminate mining leases, and given that Denison pays the unbelievable sum of \$5,000 a year to mine 28,000 acres of provincial land, for which it now has a \$7 billion contract with a \$2 billion guaranteed profit, and in view of the fact that Ontario Hydro has also lent \$650 million to Steve Roman, which will cost us \$1 billion in interest, to give him seed money to start up, with the deadlines facing this province by this contract, by the spring of 1984 the government has to give notice to cancel the contracts or forfeit the \$650 million, and we have millions of pounds of uranium which we will not need for decades—

Mr. Speaker: I hope the member does have a question.

Mr. Sargent: I think I will close off right now by asking what is the minister going to do when he faces this deadline next January?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I have not discussed that matter recently with Ontario Hydro, but I have no reason to believe there is any intention to cancel any contract at this particular stage.

As the member knows, there were some projections with respect to what the uranium requirements for the public utility would be over a protracted period of time. We have entered into additional agreements for that supply with other Canadian mines.

If the member is asking me for an update with respect to Ontario Hydro's supply requirements in that regard, I would be glad to get that further information for him.

Mr. Sargent: This is unbelievable. The minister must know he has a five-year lead time to cancel these contracts. It is very serious. It is costing us billions of dollars because we are paying \$50 a pound now and the world price is \$25 a pound. If the minister does not know about that lead time of January 1984, then we are in trouble.

Mr. Speaker: Is the minister not aware?

Hon. Mr. Welch: With all due respect, that was not the question, whether I knew anything about the lead time. I said I know nothing at the moment that would indicate Ontario Hydro plans to take advantage of any particular provisions with respect to cancellation of the contract. I thought that was the original question.

PRICE RESTRAINT MONITORING

Mr. Swart: Mr. Speaker, may I have the attention of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations? He will know that section 33 of Bill 179, the so-called wage and price

restraint bill, says that the Inflation Restraint Board shall monitor the pattern of changes in prices and wages in the private sector generally and report its findings to the minister.

Within the context of that section on prices, has the minister been monitoring the price of birth control pills? Is he aware that the manufacturer's price of the four main brands has increased 52 per cent in the last two years and 19 per cent in the last year with an eight per cent increase in January? Can the minister explain that increase and justify it?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, I may say in a very personal way that with age—and it will eventually happen to the member for Welland-Thorold too—that particular issue does not become as pressing a problem in one's life as it might on other occasions. That is not to say one should not always carefully observe, as the member does, each and every price change that takes place.

However, I do notice that the member consistently fails to point out the broad picture. Had he stood up and said in all honesty, as I suspect he really wanted to but his seat was a little sticky, that from April 1982 to April 1983 the consumer price index rose only 3.2 per cent, we might have had a better understanding of the overall price issue that faces the citizens of this province.

I have not been particularly monitoring the issue with respect to birth control pills or the issue in general, but certainly the member has raised a question which demands a great degree of attention.

Mr. Swart: I am a little disappointed that the minister starts out making fun of this very real problem to women in our society.

The minister must know that the prices of birth control pills, and for that matter other drugs, are published every six months in the Ontario government Ministry of Health formulary. If he has not monitored prices charged to his own government, what monitoring has he done with regard to prices? Is it not true that there is not and was not the slightest sincerity in the prices section of Bill 179? If that is not the case, will the minister tell me one single product whose price he has monitored? Will he table any monitoring report that has been made since Bill 179 was passed five months ago?

2:40 p.m.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Let me assure the member—and I know I speak on behalf of many in this House when I say I do not treat the question and

the subject matter he has raised very lightly—it is and has been a very important issue in many of our lives. If he thinks otherwise, then I suspect he may have other problems we do not know about in this House yet.

May I also say that the Inflation Restraint Board will be monitoring by statute the price behaviour in the province during the course of the year. How it will be doing that will be a matter left to its determination. When I receive its report, certainly I will be prepared to consider whether it is a report that can be tabled under the statute.

ASSISTANCE TO FARMERS

Mr. McKessock: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture and Food. Is the minister aware that Ontario Ministry of Agriculture and Food offices are advising applicants to the Ontario farm adjustment assistance program that the ministry will only guarantee a certain portion of their credit and that the bank must guarantee the rest? We understand the minister said at the first of the year that he would only guarantee 50 per cent of the banks' credit portfolios, but now they are saying they only want to guarantee a portion of the individual farmer's line of credit. Is the minister aware of this change in mid-stream?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, there is no change in mid-stream. If the honourable member has a case where he alleges that a specific individual or individuals in the employ of the ministry are misinterpreting or giving out wrong information, I would like to know about it. On any given day in our 53 offices we are dealing with literally hundreds, if not thousands, of people. It is entirely possible that somebody has misinterpreted that policy, and I would like to know about it so we can correct it.

Mr. McKessock: I take it the minister is saying he is guaranteeing 100 per cent of the individual farmer's line of credit?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: What I am saying is that we are dealing with each individual case. Where we agree to approve it, that is where the provincial decision committee approves the case, in effect it is assuming it is 100 per cent. But in looking at the total portfolios, we do insist on sharing the total overall risk with the participating lenders.

Mr. McKessock: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Was that not a supplementary?

Mr. McKessock: I put an explanatory question and the minister answered it, but—

Mr. Speaker: Having regard for the afternoon and the day it is, and my generous and forgiving nature, I will recognize the member for Grey.

Mr. McKessock: I brought an individual case to the minister's attention yesterday. This farmer is coming in off the tractor and calling me every other hour. This morning I gave him the minister's number so he can call him on the off hours. I want to let the minister know how important this is. The farmer told me this morning it cost him \$36 a ton more to buy fertilizer on time. Until he gets this approved credit at the bank, the minister is adding to the inefficiency of farm operations instead of to the efficiency.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I do not intend to use the name of the individual, but I am happy to give the member the facts as I understand them. They have been given to me by my staff. The individual in question is dealing with the bank in Mount Forest. In 1982, \$42,000 was covered under option B of the farm adjustment assistance program; option C, which was a guarantee of operating credit, was for \$56,000. In 1983 the individual applied for assistance under option B, that is, the interest rate reduction grant, on \$22,000, and applied for a guarantee of a line of operating credit of \$260,000. This increase was requested, I am told, and I think the member confirmed this when he spoke to me about the case on Friday, to get back into cattle. The provincial decision committee initially rejected the application for 1983 on the basis that it was a nonviable operation.

Since then—

Mr. McKessock: Nonviable because he took their advice.

Mr. Speaker: Never mind the interjection.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: One of the strengths of this program is that the decision process is kept apart from political processes. They are good people, using good judgement and making individual judgements on the information placed before them by the applicants. When this individual originally applied, their assessment was it was not viable and, therefore, was something into which they should not risk putting almost a quarter of a million in taxpayers' dollars.

Since then the individual reapplied, and the provincial decision committee, after the reaplication, offered the individual option B at \$22,000 as requested; option C at \$160,000; \$60,000 as carryover plus half the additional amount he was requesting. This offer was

rejected by the bank because I take it he was still looking for a further \$100,000 beyond that.

In effect, the provincial decision committee was saying, "We feel, based on what we know of this farm operation, that we can go to guaranteeing \$100,000 of operating credit". I take it the individual is saying: "That is fine, but I want \$200,000. I want the bank to loan me the balance". The bank has said no.

Mr. Swart: Mr. Speaker, I want to get back to the minister's answer to the first question. If I heard him right, he said there was no limitation on the guarantee. Is it not true that when the number of second applications goes past a certain percentage of a bank's portfolio, the government then guarantees only 50 per cent of that second loan? Is that not the case? Has there not been a change from last year when there was a guarantee of the whole loan?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, last year the total risk was on the government. The member will recall that he stood in his place here and spoke at various meetings around the country, saying, "This is a program for the lenders, something that will just help the lenders." Surely the member would support the position of the government, that in extending the program for one last year, the risk should be shared by the lenders, all of whom he has no use for anyway, whether they are credit unions, trust companies or banks.

Mr. Swart: You have cut back on the guarantee.

Mr. McClellan: Sure they have. The minister should just say "yes" and sit down.

Mr. Swart: He would be a good Premier.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Yes, I did. The member will surely agree the risk should be shared between the lenders and the government, and that is what we are doing.

ALLOCATION OF HOUSING UNITS

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing. Could the minister explain why he passed the buck back to the mayors of Toronto and Ottawa when he met with them earlier this week, when they requested the province to go to bat on behalf of a fair share for those two cities of the newly announced addition to social housing prepared or proposed by the federal government in its recent budget? Why was Ontario not prepared to go to bat through this minister on behalf of people who need housing in our major cities?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, the member for Ottawa Centre is still on the path of trying to be critical without even trying to observe what was the actual discussion that took place.

I met yesterday afternoon with the mayor of Ottawa and the mayor of Toronto in relation to how the federal government might allocate the additional 2,500 units that were given to the minister responsible for housing for Canada to give to the provinces or to whomever under the nonprofit program. The day following the federal budget I was in touch with Mr. LeBlanc. I have talked with him, more by accident, at the Ottawa airport as to where the allocation was going and what amount of it might come for municipal nonprofit in Ontario.

In addition to that, I have written letters to Mr. LeBlanc. My staff has been to Ottawa to meet with Canada Mortgage and Housing Corp. and Mr. LeBlanc. We talked with Mr. LeBlanc's office again this week and we have not been given any indication from that minister at the federal level as to when he might decide to allocate the additional 2,500 units and what number will come to Ontario.

I have clearly indicated I think we should get our historical percentage, which is roughly 600 of those units. He has not even indicated what number of units will be put into the municipal nonprofit versus the private nonprofit versus the co-ops. So the suggestion of the member for Ottawa Centre that this minister and this government have not been very forceful in bringing our position to Mr. LeBlanc, the minister reporting for Canada Mortgage and Housing Corp., is absolutely wrong.

2:50 p.m.

I have pursued the position at every turn possible, which I indicated to the mayor of Toronto and the mayor of Ottawa. I asked for their assistance, as I have of the members on the opposite side of the House representing the Liberal caucus, to suggest to the federal Liberal members that one of the most important places for the allocation of the additional 2,500 units would be in the municipal nonprofit sector. I have asked them to do that so that co-operatively we might succeed.

Mr. Cassidy: The minister should perhaps be aware of the fact that he left two very frustrated mayors after the discussion and that that was far from the impression they had themselves.

Could the minister explain how the municipal authorities in Ottawa or in Toronto should be expected to cope when, to take Ottawa in

particular—the minister should know the situation there very well—the vacancy rate is two tenths of one per cent? There are more than 2,000 people on waiting lists for various kinds of social housing in Ottawa and 75 motel units are occupied because those people cannot get any other housing except the kind of emergency housing which is being provided by the regional municipality.

If that is all that is going to come from Ottawa, then why is the minister of housing not prepared to step in to ensure some answers to the housing crisis we are experiencing in major cities?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: It is interesting that the member should go off on a tangent once again. He will recall that two years ago we had the Ontario rental construction loan program which his party found reasons to criticize. But it brought 15,000 units on the marketplace of Ontario through the singular initiatives of this government; there were no others participating. This government went alone under the rental construction loan program and was able to succeed not only in bringing units on stream but in creating employment in the construction industry.

Last year the federal government, if the member will recall, came along with the Canada rental supply program. Mr. Cosgrove, the minister reporting for CMHC during that time, said he would develop 10,000 units in this province. He has not succeeded, nor has the minister following him succeeded. But they asked this province very clearly and very distinctly to stay out of the rental construction loan business; they were going to go it alone.

We went to the renter-buy program—does the member recall it?—which produced about 16,000 purchasers of homes in this province. Over half of them came from rental accommodations into the market of purchasing a home. We have been trying to contribute to the economy of Ontario and to resolve some of the shortcomings in the supply of rental accommodation in the various price ranges.

The mayors might be frustrated. That was a condition they had before ever they came to see me yesterday; I can assure the member of that. I did not create that problem. They have known what the situation was. I have indicated clearly to them what the problems happen to be. This government, I believe, has said time and again—and I trust that maybe this afternoon we might hear something further; I do not know—that we should be looking for a co-operative program between the federal and provincial governments

to try to deliver more rental units in this market as well as in the rest of Canada. One government should not be trying to do it alone; it is not possible.

We have clearly suggested we are prepared to participate in a very productive program with the federal government to try to bring more rental units into the marketplace this year and next year. There could be other programs, but we will wait and see.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, in spite of the minister's railing at and criticism of the federal government and trying to pass the buck, does he not realize he has a credibility problem when he talks about housing? He has made comments in the past that he does not believe the low vacancy rate that currently exists in Ottawa. In some of his musings in the past he has even wondered whether the government or his ministry should be involved in housing at all. How does he expect to have any credibility with those kinds of statements?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, first, if the member for Ottawa East wants to support his last statement, I would be delighted to see it because I do not recall ever saying that this government did not have a responsibility. I have said exactly the opposite.

In 16 years the government of this province, along with CMHC, has put 116,000 units into the marketplace for the less fortunate people, both seniors and families. The cost this year to the taxpayers of Ontario and Canada has been \$309 million. That is the subsidy this year. The member should not say that this government has never honoured its social commitments for the provision of housing. With 116,000 units, it is a great deal more than virtually any other government on this continent has been able to do.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, I have criticized—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: I think that was a very complete answer.

SALFORD LANDFILL SITE

Mr. Elston: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney General. As he knows, I asked a question on May 5 concerning the proposed landfill site at Salford and the appeal that is being taken to cabinet. If he has reviewed that answer, I am sure he will find that the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Norton) refused to

comment on the matter because of cabinet secrecy.

I want to point out to the Attorney General that in this case the Ministry of the Environment is also a party to that appeal. I wonder whether he does not feel, under the circumstances and in fairness to all the other parties who are participating in that appeal and who participated at the hearing level, that the position of the Minister of the Environment ought to be made known to all the other people who are putting information in front of the cabinet before that decision is made.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, that is a question that should be directed to the Minister of the Environment. At this point, I do not know what information may or may not have been made available to the other parties by that ministry. That might be a question the member for Huron-Bruce might direct to the appropriate minister.

Mr. Elston: I wonder whether the Attorney General, as the chief law officer of the province, wants to comment on whether there is a clear conflict of interest in having any input from the Minister of the Environment when that appeal goes in front of cabinet without equal opportunity for presentations by the members of the public and others who participated in the hearing concerning the Salford landfill matter.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Obviously the information the cabinet would have from the Ministry of the Environment would be very important and relevant information. I would expect that in the normal course of events the other parties would have a pretty good understanding of what the nature of that information is.

Mr. Elston: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: In view of the fact that the Minister of the Environment is now coming into the House and since the Attorney General suggested the first question be referred to him, I wonder whether he might let the Minister of the Environment answer.

Mr. Speaker: In all fairness, because of the time, it would be better to proceed to the next question.

WORKERS' COMPENSATION BOARD

Mr. Di Santo: Mr. Speaker, I want to ask a question of the Minister of Labour. Is the minister aware that as a result of a hiring freeze at the Workers' Compensation Board, rehabilitation counsellors now are requested to deal with up to 130 cases, and that because of that

situation there are two obvious negative consequences? One is that injured workers rightly feel shafted by the board because of the mockery that is called the rehabilitation department. The other is that rehabilitation counsellors are overburdened to the point where half a dozen of them have had nervous breakdowns in recent months.

Is the minister aware of this situation and is he prepared to do something at this point, given the serious situation?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the excellent work of the counsellors at the Workers' Compensation Board, and I know they are working with heavy case loads. As far as case loads are concerned, that is the situation in every board and commission related to this government in these days of restraint. I would like to say that they would be able to hire additional people, but as I understand the situation they have a policy there at present whereby they can replace employees who leave but they cannot add to their total complement.

Mr. Di Santo: I am quite shocked by the fact that the minister thinks the counsellors should have nervous breakdowns to serve an increased number of injured workers.

Does the minister not realize the morale of the employees at the board is low not only because of the incredible amount of work they have but also because of the practices of the Workers' Compensation Board? Is he aware that in many departments, especially the assessment department, the employees are required not to socialize, to the point where they cannot even make personal phone calls and they cannot even go to the washroom without asking permission of their superiors.

In fact, a memo of April 26 says: "Effective immediately, members of this team must inform me prior to leaving the area. Socializing must be kept to a minimum and I will stop people from talking to you if they come from another department."

3 p.m.

Is he aware that the whole floor now is partitioned to the point where it looks like a laager rather than a healthy place where people have to work? Will the minister inquire and have that practice stopped immediately?

Mr. Speaker: Could you just inquire and see if the practice can be stopped?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: There was a series of questions,

and I would suggest that you answer the last one.

Mr. Di Santo: It is a multiple question.

Interjections.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege: I do not think it is within the right of the Speaker to interpret the question. The member has the ability to put his own questions and you should not make assumptions.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The member for Grey-Bruce, please resume your seat. The Minister of Labour, answer the last question, please.

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Maybe I can answer all three at one time, Mr. Speaker, if that is permissible. I think it would be wise for the honourable member, myself and Mr. Kerr, the assistant general manager of the WCB, who is attending all the meetings of the resources development committee at the present time, to get together at one of these meetings at the very earliest opportunity and discuss the very real problem that the member has brought to our attention. I think it deserves attention and I think that is the best way we can handle it.

Ms. Copps: Mr. Speaker, the minister must recognize that in today's economy with the tremendous increase in unemployment—I point simply to the youth unemployment figure of 17.1 per cent across this province—to say there will be absolutely no expansion, merely the replacement of rehabilitation counsellors, does not recognize the very real problems placed on injured workers who are forced to go out and compete in the job market with able-bodied people who cannot get a job.

It would seem to me that in the minister's response he should recognize that it is critical for the workers not only that we expand the rehabilitation component, but also, with respect to cost effectiveness, to expand at the rehabilitation end is the most cost effective way of delivering a service not only to the workers but also to the province and the people of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, I would apologize to the member for Hamilton Centre and to the others who may have misconstrued my answer. Perhaps I was not clear in what I was attempting to say.

The total complement, as I understand it, is frozen. However, that certainly allows for the redistribution of staff.

Mr. Di Santo: It is not so. You know that.

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: It is my understanding that an additional counsellor—and I will check this

before our meeting—was added to the complement very recently.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege: I have been in this House a long time—20 years—and I think question period is becoming a farce because of the way you view your part with the government here.

For instance, to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Mr. Bennett) you say, "It was a good answer." You have never said to any of us, "It was a good question."

Interjections.

Mr. Sargent: Just a moment, I am not through yet.

Mr. Speaker: Go ahead.

Mr. Sargent: You can ask anybody in the opposition. We feel very much that you favour the government all the time in your remarks. I think it is time you were totally impartial. I really mean that.

Mr. Speaker: Those are interesting comments. I would point out to the member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Sargent), as I pointed out to all other honourable members a few weeks ago, I ask for their co-operation in sharing the question period so that back-benchers will be able to participate more fully than they have in the past.

I was not complimenting the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing particularly. That was my way of telling him that his time was used up. I am taking very close note of the time spent by those people asking questions and those people answering questions. I will continue to do so because that happens to be one of my responsibilities.

PETITIONS

KICKBOXING AND FULL-CONTACT KARATE

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Speaker, I have further petitions to present to the House in response to the statement to ban events of kickboxing and full-contact karate made by the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Elgie) on February 15. In the same form as the earlier presentations, these petitions add a further 3,113 names to the previous total of 8,704, making a grand total of 11,817 signatories interested in this matter.

ANNUAL REPORT, MINISTRY OF NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. J. A. Reed: Mr. Speaker, under standing order 33(b), we, the undersigned, petition that

the annual report of the Ministry of Natural Resources for the year ending March 31, 1982, be referred to the standing committee on resources development.

EDUCATION TAXES

Ms. Copps: Mr. Speaker, I have a petition signed by the presidents of the seven Catholic high schools in Hamilton, representing approximately 7,000 students, advising the Ontario government of the reasonableness of their request that separate school supporters be allowed to designate all of their education tax, elementary and secondary, for the support of Catholic elementary and secondary schools.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

LANDLORD AND TENANT AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. McMurtry moved, seconded by Hon. Mr. Wells, first reading of Bill 32, An Act to amend the Landlord and Tenant Act.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, a number of rental apartment building owners have and are utilizing complicated conveyancing schemes that have the effect of avoiding condominium conversion controls. The bill I am introducing today deals with the most urgent problems raised by these new conveyancing techniques. It is intended to protect the tenants of buildings where these conveyancing schemes have been used. In particular, my colleagues the member for Lakeshore (Mr. Kolyn), the member for Oriole (Mr. Williams) and the member for Humber (Mr. Kells) have brought a number of these situations to my personal attention.

The conveyancing schemes that are of concern fall into two general categories. In the first, the building is conveyed to a corporation. Shares in the corporation are sold to the public and a shareholders' agreement between the shareholders grants to each shareholder the right to occupy a specific unit in the building. The second scheme involves selling the building to a group of individuals as tenants in common with co-ownership agreements between the co-owners granting each co-owner a right to occupy a specific unit in the building. In each case the purchasers acquire their claim to a specific unit through an occupancy agreement with their fellow purchasers.

Until recently it had been believed that existing tenants were protected from eviction by persons who had purchased interest in build-

ings by way of these new conveyancing schemes. However, in March of this year the Divisional Court ruled that a purchaser could evict a tenant on the ground that the purchaser desired the premises for his or her own use.

3:10 p.m.

The bill I am introducing today is intended to restore the protection that tenants were thought to have had before the recent Divisional Court decision. It provides that where the landlord is seeking a rental unit for the purpose of his own use, and his claim is based on an occupancy agreement that purports to entitle him to reside in the unit, the judge hearing the application must refuse the eviction order. The only exceptions permitted by the bill relate to very small buildings and to situations where the landlord or his immediate family previously occupied the unit.

I want to emphasize that this bill will apply to all court hearings that take place after the bill is enacted, including those that relate to notices of termination given before that day. Therefore, tenants of buildings that have been subject to these complicated conveyancing schemes and who have already received notices of termination will be protected once this legislation is passed.

I hope all members of this House will assist in giving the bill early approval.

GOOD SAMARITAN ACT

Mr. Haggerty moved, seconded by Mr. Kerrio, first reading of Bill 33, An Act to relieve Persons from Liability in respect to Voluntary Emergency Medical and First Aid Services.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Haggerty: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to relieve persons from liability in respect to voluntary emergency first aid assistance or medical services rendered at or near the scene of an accident or other sudden emergency.

EXPLANATORY STATEMENTS

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: The Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry) in introducing his bill has, as has been customary in the past, given us a fairly lengthy description of the contents. It seems to me that during the last revision of rules it was decided that ministers having an explanatory statement for a bill should give it under statements so that when the bill is introduced the private members of the House are really aware of its contents.

I think they are slipping away from that procedure considerably. It would be too bad if the opposition did not have knowledge of the contents of a ministerial bill being introduced, in case we wanted to oppose it on first reading.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

House in committee of the whole.

TORONTO FUTURES EXCHANGE ACT

Resuming the adjourned consideration of Bill 7, An Act to incorporate the Toronto Futures Exchange.

On section 13:

Mr. Chairman: If memory serves me correctly, the member for Carleton (Mr. Mitchell) was dealing with the proposed amendment to section 13. Had you read the amendment?

Mr. Mitchell: The amendment has been introduced, Mr. Chairman. I have some background information on this amendment which should be back here shortly and a copy will be provided to each of the opposition critics. Basically, as members will recall, this motion allows the Toronto Futures Exchange, along with the Toronto Stock Exchange, to enter into certain agreements with the builders of a building. This amendment will allow them to hold purchased land.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Chairman, I do not hear the minister's assistant saying he is going to make the changes that were proposed on this side, despite the fact that, as I said in the House a few nights ago prior to the excitement over the budget leak, the amendment would permit the futures exchange to acquire the farm belonging to the member for Kent-Elgin (Mr. McGuigan) or some other completely irrelevant piece of property.

The minister's assistant has told me privately that the purpose is to allow the futures exchange to participate in holding certain properties in the new stock exchange headquarters which might be required for future expansion. I see nothing wrong with that. It is perfectly reasonable that they might have to acquire a part of that building and then rent it out for a few years until such time as they need to expand. I would not think anybody in this House would object to that except in so far as we might object to the concept of trading in futures.

What really troubles me, since the assistant says in effect that the explanatory material will justify doing what is being done here, is that yesterday the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) said in

this House that when it comes to a budget the government stood or fell on the budget and that the only role of the Legislature was to make minor amendments to bills. In other words, we are to serve the function of proofreaders, except we are very high-priced proofreaders, because it costs many thousands of dollars for each hour that this Legislature is in session.

Now the parliamentary assistant, presumably acting under the instruction of either the civil servants or his minister, is saying that even to make helpful suggestions and proposals to improve the bill is not going to be accepted but that, right or wrong, the draftsmen who did this have to be protected; the situation as it is proposed has to be accepted, because that is the way his internal committee approved it and that is the way it came forward originally.

For goodness' sake, we might as well pack this place up and meet one day a year. A guillotine could be put on and the government could have all the bills it wanted. We can simply pass bills using the guillotine at the end of the day by moving the previous question, if that is the attitude the government intends to take.

The explanation was not made available to me. I will read it while the assistant comments, or perhaps he would like to comment on it; but in a general way all of us in this House should be concerned about the trivial way in which the House appears to be taken.

Mr. Mitchell: Mr. Chairman, we had some copies being made but, unfortunately, only one copy has been brought back. I am attempting to get another copy for the critic for the Liberal Party. I hope to have that shortly and I can read it into the record.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Chairman, certainly the member for Carleton may proceed, and I will try to catch up when I get my copy. We will not delay the House for that.

Mr. Cassidy: Would the minister's assistant like to have this copy to read into the record?

Mr. Laughren: I don't know what it's coming to around here.

Mr. Chairman: Would someone tell me what we are doing?

Mr. Mitchell: Mr. Chairman, I was asked by the member for Ottawa Centre whether we would consider putting an amendment to our original amendment, which is number 13. I did raise the issue, not only with the people representing the Toronto Stock Exchange but also with our own legal counsel, and I am quite

comfortable that the wording in amendment 13 is that which is required.

This amendment gives the Toronto Futures Exchange powers to hold land, which are the same as the powers which a normal business corporation has but which go beyond the land holding powers ordinarily held by a nonprofit corporation. The powers proposed to be given to the Toronto Futures Exchange are identical to the powers now held by the Toronto Stock Exchange. The reason for providing these expanded powers arises solely from the development of the Exchange Tower, which is part of a development in Toronto.

The existence of the Toronto Futures Exchange results from a specific requirement of the Ontario Securities Commission. When a futures market was first proposed in Ontario it was put forward by the Toronto Stock Exchange, which contemplated commodity futures trading as a part of the range of products available on the Toronto Stock Exchange.

However, the Ontario Securities Commission ordered that a new and separate exchange be created under the sponsorship of the TSE for trading in commodities, commodity futures contracts, options on commodities and commodity futures options. Accordingly, Bill 7 was prepared and put forward by the Toronto Stock Exchange, with the concurrence of the Ontario Securities Commission, as a method of effecting this requirement.

3:20 p.m.

When the Toronto Stock Exchange took the decision to move to new facilities, it was made on the principle that it must continue to be located in the downtown core of Toronto and it must continue to hold a direct equity investment in land in the downtown Toronto core. To achieve those results, the arrangements made by the Toronto Stock Exchange with Olympia and York include an equity ownership interest in the development which constitutes the Exchange Tower.

That development includes the new trading floor to be used by both the Toronto Futures Exchange and the Toronto Stock Exchange, a 32-storey office tower in which the Toronto Futures Exchange will, and the Toronto Stock Exchange now does, occupy office space, and including facilities for the Canadian Depository for Securities Ltd. and a commercial complex and parking facility under the office tower and trading floor.

The arrangement with Olympia and York permits the Toronto Stock Exchange and the

Toronto Futures Exchange to expand the space occupied by them in this new office tower. The expanded land holding power is necessary to permit the Toronto Futures Exchange, as it was necessary to permit the Toronto Stock Exchange, to take an equity interest in this project and thereby to accomplish the TSE's objective of retaining an equity interest in land in downtown Toronto.

It was neither appropriate nor sensible to attempt to subdivide the interests of the TSE and the TFE from those of Olympia and York in this project or to attempt to divide the interests of the Toronto Futures Exchange from those of the TSE. They are inextricably linked together in a new development which provides more space than they need for their own use or occupation but in which the TSE now has an equity interest that enables it to achieve its long-term goals.

The TSE's interest in the Exchange Tower is permitted by section 12 of the Toronto Stock Exchange Act and the proposed provision of Bill 7 would enable the Toronto Futures Exchange to hold such an equity interest as well. I am therefore satisfied that this amendment is in order.

Mr. Cassidy: I accept that the intricacies of holding a portion of the Exchange Tower are complicated and therefore wording this broad might be required, provided it was limited to the Exchange Tower. Would the parliamentary assistant agree to stand this down so that we may make it refer specifically to the Exchange Tower?

It seems to me we are creating a nonprofit corporation here. It will not be under the direct regulation or control of this Legislature or the government except in so far as legislation could come through the Legislature again. Yet we are creating a body that would technically have the power to invest in property anywhere in Ontario. They could do so in the riding of my friend the member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick), my friend the member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Laughren) or my friend the member for Oakwood (Mr. Grande). They could even do it in Ottawa Centre. Surely that is not what was intended.

I was just beginning to write out the amendment when the minister sat down. The words I would add would further amend the amendment by adding the words, "provided that such land or interest therein is located in connection with the Exchange Tower in downtown Toronto." If the minister's assistants have some other modification to that, then let us put that in. I do

not think that is unreasonable, because I do not see why people should come in here and get all kinds of powers they ostensibly do not want and why we should give people powers unless we intend to do so.

Mr. Mitchell: Would the member for Ottawa Centre be prepared to send me a copy of his proposed amendment so I can look at it very quickly? My immediate reaction is that I am not prepared to stand it down, but if he will send me a copy of the amendment we might be able to resolve what appears to be an impasse.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Chairman, it might be preferable to stand section 13 down and complete the rest of the bill.

Mr. Mitchell: I will go with the next amendment until such time as I have a copy.

Mr. Chairman: Then we will deal with section 14 and we will stand section 13 down.

On section 14:

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Mitchell moves that section 14 of the bill be amended by inserting, after "131" in the first line, "275."

Mr. Mitchell: Mr. Chairman, this amendment is basically housekeeping and coincides with the broadened land holding powers we hope will be included in section 13. It adds a reference to section 275 of the Corporations Act, the land holding provision.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Chairman, the point we are raising is we will come back when we look at the stood-down clause and we will not discuss the amendment proposed here. We will simply let it go through.

Section 14, as amended, agreed to.

Sections 15 and 16, inclusive, agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Do we just sit quietly and wait for the member for Carleton?

On section 13:

Mr. Mitchell: Unfortunately, my understanding from legal counsel is if we do what is suggested in the amendment proposed by the NDP, then we must enter into legal descriptions of the building in question. I am not able to do that at this time so I must honestly say that at this point I cannot entertain the amendment.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Chairman, there are four other bills to be done. I am sure the matter could be sorted out in half an hour. This was raised for the attention of the minister or his assistant last Thursday and there has been ample time to look at the issue.

The issue is clearly stated in the sense that the

objection was not to a certain broadening of powers, but to the right of the futures exchange to hold property anywhere in Ontario, which is clearly unrelated to its purpose. I suggest we simply stand down this clause while it is fixed up by the minister's people. There are about three or four other bills. Perhaps we can get on with them and come back to this particular clause over which we have had some disagreement.

Mr. Chairman: That is a good and honourable suggestion, but—

Mr. Mitchell: Mr. Chairman, we may be able to resolve this quickly if the House will concur in allowing me to move down to the opposite end of the bench, down near the front. Hopefully, I may be able to resolve this quickly.

Mr. Chairman: Is that acceptable? Agreed.

Mr. Mitchell: If it meets with the concurrence of the critic for the third party and if he is prepared in regard to his amendment—and I am going to have to confirm the actual wording—to say the land holdings are restricted to Metro Toronto, we would be prepared to accept something in that vein.

Mr. Cassidy: In the spirit of compromise, I would be prepared to accept that and I hope this kind of thing could be more narrowly defined next time. I appreciate that is perhaps a compromise. It still allows them to own property in North York, but that is perhaps a bit more appropriate than the member for Kent-Elgin's riding.

Mr. Mitchell: My understanding would be that the wording added, the amendment that is proposed by the New Democratic Party critic, would be the words following, "provided that such land or interest therein is located in Metropolitan Toronto."

Mr. Cassidy: I am sure that is exactly what I said, whether it is the amendment of the minister's assistant or not.

Mr. Mitchell: "In the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto."

Mr. Cassidy: We will be prepared to accept that.

Mr. Breithaupt: If we have to do this, it might be helpful if, after the word "therein," at least in the third line of the printed amendment, we had the phrase "in the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto."

Mr. Mitchell: That is agreeable.

3:30 p.m.

Mr. Chairman: That seems an agreeable

approach. We have all heard the amendment to the amendment. I do not have a copy in front of me but I think in the spirit of getting on with it we should do so.

Mr. McGuigan: I want to ask a question.

Mr. Cassidy: This is all for your sake.

Mr. McGuigan: This may be self-evident, but does this in any way stop the exchange from renting quarters in any other locality?

Mr. Mitchell: It does not.

Mr. Chairman: We have all heard the amendment to the amendment. Is it the pleasure of the House that it carry?

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Is it the pleasure of the House that the the amendment carry?

Motion agreed to.

Section 13, as amended, agreed to.

Section 17 agreed to.

Bill 7, as amended, reported.

On motion by Hon. Miss Stephenson, the committee of the whole House reported one bill with certain amendments.

MOTOR VEHICLE DEALERS AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Mitchell: Mr. Speaker, I believe this bill is self-explanatory. What it basically does is create a compensation fund which does away with the old method of bonding. If I can use an example, having been in the municipal field, many municipalities have run into problems over the past number of years with this whole issue of bonding because of the legal problems one has to go into. To get a resolution of that—

Mr. Speaker: Before you get on with the explanation, can you move second reading of the bill?

Mr. Mitchell: Mr. Speaker, I apologize.

Mr. Mitchell, on behalf of Hon. Mr. Elgie, moved second reading of Bill 3, An Act to amend the Motor Vehicle Dealers Act.

Mr. Mitchell: Mr. Speaker, that showed my eagerness to get some of these done.

I think the critics for the opposition party and the third party are aware that we are talking of a registration fee of probably \$150 to be paid by each dealer, which should be no problem and which is, as far as I am aware, no problem because the current cost to them for a bond for a one-year period is somewhere in the vicinity of \$75 to \$100. I suggest this bill will be a better way of protection for the public.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Speaker, in principle we support this kind of legislation, because a compensation fund will deal more fairly with all the persons in the business by having all of them participate under one program.

I recognize that the cost of a one-year bond, as the parliamentary assistant has said, may range from \$75 to \$100. I would appreciate hearing from the parliamentary assistant as to whether this \$150 initial cost is going to be meant to last for some time to get things started and whether we will simply have to take it as it comes over the next several years to see what annual assessments might be.

It could be the parliamentary assistant has some information now as to the variety of claims being made against the insurance bonding that the various individual dealers now have. The experience of the insurance companies in these matters will give us some guide as to what the expected cost may well be in the future.

He may not have that information, I do not know, but certainly that is the sort of thing that should be made available to us as we go into a new kind of program.

As we look at the development of the travel agents' circumstances, we have seen on a number of occasions that there has been a clear benefit to many members of the public by having a program in place where a chartered flight did not materialize or, indeed, where a certain hotel to which a group of guests were travelling in the Caribbean, or wherever it might be, might have had a problem.

So we see this kind of program as one that is developing the approach of effective responsibility among the members of a certain group rather than having them provide individual insurance opportunities and have their own coverages.

We, as I say, are supportive of the principle of this fund. We are supportive of the ideas involved that will ensure a responsibility among those dealing with motor vehicles within the province and will fairly share the burden of cost among all those in the business. We certainly will support the bill.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, I was not sure whether the parliamentary assistant sought to intervene or was trying to close out the debate. The basic principle here, given that it was 1965 when the present arrangement was established, is one that we are prepared to support.

I do have some comments with respect to a way by which we believe this bill should be broadened, but before making those comments

I would like to ask whether the parliamentary assistant could provide a bit more information with respect to the working of this fund in its proposed way.

In particular, what claims from the public would be accepted? How will the fund be administered? I do not think that has been spelled out in the bill. To whom would claims actually be submitted? What grounds of appeal or redress would there be if a motor vehicle purchaser felt he was being inadequately or unfairly dealt with in respect of the compensation he thinks he should be getting from the compensation fund that is being established in this act?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Cousens): That will be responded to in the final statement because we are not in committee. If the member has any further comments on the bill he may make them now.

Mr. Cassidy: I will talk a bit further then, Mr. Chairman—

The Acting Speaker: I am Mr. Speaker at this point. We are not in committee of the whole House.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, you will have to appreciate that I am getting back into the habit of handling bills. It has been some time.

What I would like to say is this. It seems to me that if the minister who is in charge now is not one of those who believes that government has no role in the marketplace at all, if anything he is perhaps at odds with some of his colleagues in feeling that from time to time government does have a role in the marketplace, and given that the automobile is the second most important consumer purchase that most people make—the house being the most important, and many people these days may not have a chance to afford to buy a home in Ontario—it seems to me there is need for the kind of legislation that has been adopted in a number of other jurisdictions in North America to protect purchasers of cars that turn out to be lemons.

3:40 p.m.

The parliamentary assistant is familiar with the kind of situation that happens. Somebody buys a car and the darned thing starts to rust irrevocably after a month or two; or it goes back and back and back to the makers, and the repairs never get made. Somehow the difficulty never seems to be ironed out. It seems as though the people who made and sold the car have abdicated their sense of responsibility and they just wish to tough out the protest until the

period of their warranty or guarantee has run out.

The individual can occasionally go to court, but the claims permissible in small claims court are not adequate to gain full compensation if you have a lemon. The personal aggravation for people, who often are busy or may need a car for their work or for getting to and from work, can be enormous and at times absolutely devastating if they rely on a car and it just is not there.

My colleague the member for Etobicoke (Mr. Philip) put forward some time ago a private member's bill that was designed to protect the purchasers of new motor vehicles. Bearing in mind that this is the purpose of this compensation fund, it seems to me the ministry should have been prepared to consider incorporating the type of lemon-aid protection the member for Etobicoke was proposing in this compensation fund, since the basis of the fund is being changed.

I think the minister will recognize that this is not a costly thing as far as reputable dealers are concerned, because reputable dealers are prepared to deal fairly with people who find they are stuck with a car that plainly was made wrong. Maybe it was made on a Friday afternoon just before the long weekend, or maybe it is just bad luck that occasionally a car may not work; I do not want to go into that.

The fact is that the purchaser, who these days pays \$10,000 or more for an automobile, should not be stuck with a heap of junk if two or three months after beginning to own it he finds that the thing is chronically and constantly back in for repairs, that the manufacturer and the dealer cannot get it right, that they are trying to fob it off on him and get him to sign a paper in return for \$200, when that purchaser should be entitled to a new car and should let the manufacturer and the dealer sort out the problems of whatever was wrong with the existing automobile.

When we come to committee, I will propose a form of amendment that, given the nature of the bill, will be permissive rather than mandatory, but at the very least will permit the government, through order in council, to set up that kind of compensation, that kind of protection, for people who have the misfortune to have a lemon.

If the parliamentary assistant is prepared to accept this amendment and then to see to it that the cabinet acts on it, then he and his government will be seen as champions of consumers across the province, a role that, as the parliamentary assistant knows, has been confined in

the past to my colleague who is present here, the member for Welland-Thorold (Mr. Swart).

I hope the parliamentary assistant will comment on those points, because I think it would be a valuable and innovative step for the government to take. We have done so in the case of new homes. There is now effectively a means of getting redress if there are defects in the construction of new homes. That bill was adopted and passed by this government several years ago. If the government were prepared to do it that way with respect to homes, then surely, given the importance in the consumer's budget of buying a new car, they should be prepared to act here as well.

Mr. Haggerty: Mr. Speaker, I want to address myself to Bill 3, An Act to amend the Motor Vehicle Dealers Act, and to support my colleague the member for Kitchener (Mr. Breithaupt). We in this party support such measures.

But the bill does raise some questions. There is not very much in the explanatory notes that tells us what the intent of the bill really is. It says, "The new provision authorizes the Lieutenant Governor in Council to make regulations establishing a compensation fund." It goes on to say in section 2: "(o) providing for the establishment, maintenance and administration of the motor vehicle dealers compensation fund including prescribing provisions relating to investing and paying out of money from the fund."

This indicates to me that the government is trying to plug a hole in the present business practices of automobile dealers permitted to sell vehicles in Ontario.

Some problems have been brought to my attention over the past number of years by constituents regarding used cars in particular. The cars are sold here in Toronto from one dealer to another; such a car may go to a dealer in Kitchener or in Brantford, and from Brantford it may go to a dealer in Fort Erie.

Mr. Mitchell: The wholesalers.

Mr. Haggerty: The wholesalers, this is right. The problem is that in many cases the odometer has been altered. The last dealer who sells the vehicle says it is a one-owner car. I suppose this is the premise when they want to sell some of these cars. No doubt some of the dealers are reputable and good dealers but are not aware of the registration of a vehicle and how many dealers it has been passed through. Apparently they do not register every dealer the vehicle

moves from in the transaction to the final dealer in the area who is going to get rid of a vehicle.

I have had cases where the odometer has been altered considerably. There have been three or four owners. In a number of cases the cars have been leased cars, perhaps from one of the major automobile leasing dealers in Ontario. It could be a number of them. One can raise the matter with the consumer protection bureau, but one cannot get too far with them because they say, "There is nothing much more that we can do in this area."

I always thought there were areas where persons could be charged under the act and that one could go after them, but it is difficult when one goes from one dealer to another dealer. Some place along the line these things have been changed, and it is usually the consumer who has to pay for it in the long run.

What are we talking about as compensation in this area? Sometimes one may get a car with 30,000 kilometres on it when, in fact, it may have travelled 130,000 kilometres; it has gone around the clock, if the members follow me.

An individual, particularly a female, may go in wanting to buy an automobile, not realizing the odometer, which says 30,000, has gone around 100,000 kilometres. The dealer says, "It only has 30,000 kilometres on it." It is not realized that he has dropped off the 100,000. Is there some way we can correct the misuse of this so people do not encounter such difficulties when they buy a used motor vehicle?

In one particular case, a person was going to lay a charge and found out he would have to go through about 10 different dealers. The last dealer says, "I am not responsible for changing anything on the odometer on the vehicle." I suggest the area of compensation should be rather heavy here, or perhaps there should be an alternative to compensation so a dealer may well lose his licence. It is a chain of dealers I am talking about. One might call them brokers in this area.

Mr. Mitchell: That may well be altered with the new licences.

Mr. Haggerty: I always thought they were supposed to show the kilometres as they are in the sale or transfer of a motor vehicle from an individual to a garage or a person selling new automobiles. I bring to the parliamentary assistant's attention that this is an area that should be controlled under legislation so things such as this do not happen. I think it is an unfair business practice.

I hope that somewhere this bill is going to

provide that when one purchases a vehicle, the guarantee or warranty is going to be there, at least for the 30 days, that there is going to be a true mileage or kilometre indicator and that it is the true picture. Maybe what should be done is that when a person buys a car, he gets a chance to see even a copy of the transfer of licence plate and what the actual mileage is on that vehicle. At present, there is a way they can get around it and I do not think it is fair to the consumer buying a vehicle.

3:50 p.m.

Mr. Samis: Mr. Speaker, I want to speak briefly on this bill. Naturally, all of us on this side support it. As my colleague the member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy) has mentioned, I want to call to the attention of the parliamentary assistant the legislation in Quebec and the approach it has taken in this matter.

It seems to me we have individual pieces of legislation that could benefit the consumer, whether it be the Business Practices Act or legislation regarding dealers and the turning back of odometers. I suppose the option to go to small claims court to recover damages is available at times to the consumer.

I prefer the more comprehensive, more thorough approach taken by Quebec. When any consumer goes in to deal for a car with a dealer, the legislation guarantees him certain things before the deal is signed. I do not have the file here with me, but I seem to recall that dealers are obliged to present the customer with a full history of the car. They have to tell the customer what parts of the car have been replaced, how long they have had the car and things of that sort. It is fairly detailed, but it is also, as I recall from talking to Quebec people, written in fairly simple language so consumers can understand it. It was not written in legalese. I recall about four or five years ago introducing a private members' bill to the same effect.

It seems to me that approach would be much more consumer-oriented and more protective of consumer interests than this approach. I realize this is an advance but, in terms of protecting the interests of consumers, I do not think the teeth are really there to protect them.

I recall when my wife was in charge of the consumer aid office, and we did have one in Cornwall, the most frequent complaints she got from people were about car dealers in the community. Most people had no idea what rights they had or what legal recourse they had.

The problem is that when most citizens deal with car dealers, the cards are really stacked in

favour of the dealers; they know all the tricks of the trade, the ins and outs. There are so many ins and outs in the auto game that many consumers are totally baffled, bamboozled and bewitched by the whole thing.

Mr. Kerrio: Are most car dealers Conservatives?

Mr. Samis: Social Credit, with maybe a few Liberals thrown in. Bob Andras was a car dealer, was he not?

We have to do something more comprehensive to protect the interests of the consumer. I do not think compensation goes far enough, and I commend to the parliamentary assistant a detailed look at the Quebec legislation. I must say I was impressed by the consumer bias in that legislation; it was extremely refreshing.

I recall at the time I introduced my private member's bill I called up a couple of car dealers, one in Hull and two in Montreal, to sample their reaction. They were fairly candid in saying they obviously were not enthusiastic about it, because they had to be much more careful of what they did, but they could live with it. I follow the Quebec press fairly carefully, and I have not seen much printed in it since that bill became law, complaining about the legislation.

The result has been that when people want a good used car or they want to be fairly safe in what they are doing, they go to a registered car dealer as opposed to private sales. That has given consumers a much greater sense of confidence and assurance when they decide to make a purchase. It is the greatest purchase a person makes in life beyond that of a house. In that sense, it has given greater credibility to the whole car dealer profession in Quebec. It is a perennial knock against car dealers that they rank pretty low on the totem pole when it comes to public confidence and trust. They were competing with politicians and lawyers, if I am not mistaken, in the last poll.

I suggest to the parliamentary assistant that we take a more pro-consumer, more comprehensive, Quebec-style approach to the overall problem of dissatisfaction with car dealers. I think the end result will be a better industry, a better business and a more satisfied motoring public.

Mr. McGuigan: Mr. Speaker, I can agree with many of the remarks that have been made about the overall car sales business. I am presuming that really all we are covering here, and I would like a little more explanation, is the financial security of people who have bought a car.

Perhaps they have made a down payment on the car and the car never arrives. The sales company goes broke or absconds with the funds or whatever. I see the parliamentary assistant nodding his head so that probably is covered. Can he tell us what the bill does in the case of a used car on which there might be a lien?

The Acting Speaker: The parliamentary assistant will provide his answer to that in the final wrapup.

Mr. McGuigan: All right, as long as he responds to that. We are finding that is getting to be a rather troublesome thing in farm machinery. A farmer may go to an auction sale and buy a piece of farm equipment, then later the sheriff may come around and say: "Hey, that is my client's." I guess it would be the lawyer first and then the sheriff saying, "That piece of equipment does not belong to you; it belongs to someone else." This could amount to a very large sum of money.

I want to take the opportunity to scold the government for bringing in this legislation for car buyers and still leaving out in the cold people such as those in my riding—and surely there must be others across this province—who have delivered their commodities. I think we have talked about lemons; I am talking about tomatoes—and people who have delivered their tomatoes to a tomato factory. If the company goes broke, everybody in a secured position gets paid except the farmer who made it all possible in the first place by providing the tomatoes to make the factory viable. He gets what is left, which usually is zero.

We do have an act already on the statutes of this province, the Farm Products Payments Act. It is actually in effect, but it requires a triggering mechanism to bring it into operation. It requires the marketing boards in a particular case to petition the government to enforce and set up just such a fund as this insurance fund. As a matter of fact, the act does provide \$250,000 as seed money that can be used: \$50,000 in each of five different areas. We have this great act and an illusion of protection, yet it has not been put into effect.

Every time I mention this to the Minister of Agriculture and Food, he says, "You want me to force it upon the industry." It looks to me as if this legislation is being forced upon the industry, because it refers to "requiring participation in the fund by motor vehicle dealers." They are all required to go into the fund whether they wish to or not. I hope perhaps the parliamentary assistant will comment on what sort of reaction

there is by motor vehicle dealers. Do they approve of this in general or do some of them disapprove? He is nodding his head, but I would like to hear his comments.

I will expand on that if you will allow me, Mr. Speaker, because this is somewhat off the topic, although it has to do with funds.

When the marketing board people negotiate a price each year with the various canning or packing companies, depending on the particular product, they always try to get the very best possible deal they can for their clients, the producers. The big processors, companies like Heinz, Campbell Soup or Libby, are really not much interested in participating in a fund that would help to guarantee payment to some of the smaller companies. It is apt to be the small company that goes broke, rather than the large processing companies, although we know also that large companies can go bankrupt or can come very close to it, as in the case of the Chrysler Corp.—although they seem to have somewhat recovered—and Massey-Ferguson. There are also other examples in North America and around the world of big companies going bankrupt.

These people are reluctant to participate in a plan that might assist those smaller producers and packing plants; so generally they set the matter aside and nothing is done. That has been the case in the past. There is a company in my riding, Southland Canning, that has gone broke. In fact, to be more accurate, they are in receivership. They owe 15 growers just slightly more than \$500,000.

The Acting Speaker: The member is really going off subject now.

Mr. McGuigan: I will wrap it up, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to draw the comparison. Here we are eagerly going into the situation where we are aiding the consumer, but when it comes to the primary producer in the field of agriculture, who makes all of this possible, we are not quite so eager.

4 p.m.

Mr. Swart: Mr. Speaker, as the member who had responsibility in our party for this bill when it was introduced and who gave some thought to it, I want to make a few comments on it. Most of the comments I wanted to make have been touched on; so I am going to be very brief.

However, it seems to me that this bill has nothing to do with giving any added protection to the consumer. It is very limited in its scope. What it does is substitute a system of insurance

for the bond that has been in existence up to this time. It may well make it easier for an individual who has bought an automobile to collect if a dealer goes into receivership. It will facilitate the whole thing for the dealer and the courts. That is a good move, but it is very limited in its scope.

We have had changes in the Motor Vehicle Dealers Act on a number of occasions with regard to the odometer, the mechanical certificate and a variety of areas giving some protection for the consumer. As my colleague the member for Etobicoke (Mr. Philip) pointed out in his private member's bill and as the member for Kent-Elgin (Mr. McGuigan) and others in the official opposition have said, there is still a wide area for improvement in consumer protection with regard to the purchasing of motor vehicles.

As so often happens when we bring in legislation, those who want to circumvent it devise new tactics to take in the consumer. Although the measures which the government has brought in over the years admittedly have been of some benefit, the improvements in this area have been very slow. Perhaps the parliamentary assistant will tell us whether he knows if there will be some additional amendments brought in during this session with regard to consumer protection, besides what we have here, which are a change in the method of getting reimbursement if a dealer goes broke.

There is one other thing that concerns me about this bill. Unlike almost all other bills that have been before this House, this bill enacts nothing. It does say there is going to be a fund enacted, but everything is left up to regulation. It makes it permissive for regulations to be enacted "providing for the establishment, maintenance and administration of the motor vehicle dealers compensation fund, including prescribing provisions relating to investing and paying out of money from the fund."

Then, in clause 2(p), the bill says, "providing for the payment of levies into the fund by participants and prescribing the amounts thereof;" and then for the consumer, "(q) providing for payment out of the fund of claims and procedures to be followed in respect thereto."

The only mandatory thing we have in the bill is the setting up of a fund and requiring participation in the fund by all motor vehicle dealers. Those two things are good, but perhaps the parliamentary assistant could give us some assurance that this fund is going to be adequate to pay all claims.

I also ask him, is the government going to pay 100 per cent of all claims? In the Re-Mor situation, which I grant is an ad hoc case, they are going to reimburse investors for only two thirds of their losses. I suggest that the regulations the minister could set up under this bill could provide for a 50 per cent payment of losses or a 75 per cent payment of losses or a 25 per cent payment of losses.

I know there is a question here—and I guess that is what the whole thing is based on—of the legal liability of the motor vehicle dealer. They pay that and nothing more. But it seems to me if we are bringing in a bill that is going to replace the bond, there should be some statement that total compensation will be paid.

Interjection.

Mr. Swart: Perhaps the member for Kitchener has some comments in that regard.

Mr. Breithaupt: It should be at least as strong as the bond.

Mr. Swart: As the member for Kitchener points out, it should be at least as strong as the bond. I would like to see it go even further and require that 100 per cent compensation be paid automatically for all legal liability that exists. The bill does not say that. I am not denying that may very well be the intention; the parliamentary assistant is an honourable man.

If increases are made in the payments which a motor vehicle dealer will have to make, I believe \$150 is not enough to pay all of it, especially under the present circumstances. The member for Kitchener asked the parliamentary assistant to give some indication of the kind of claims we have at the present time. If these claims are high, with the economic situation the way it is today, and if we have to raise that from \$150 to \$250 and perhaps to \$500, is the government going to be pressured by the motor vehicle dealers so that only a portion of these claims will be paid? It is not quite good enough to leave all these decisions and details—in fact, the total bill—to regulations.

Because the bill in principle is an improvement on what we have, we are going to support it, but I do not want the parliamentary assistant to think for one minute that we do not have some pretty strong reservations about it. There should be more principles established in this bill for consumer protection. Even if we only want to deal with the changeover from bonding to insurance, we should have more principles involved in that insurance which is going to be provided by this changeover.

To me the bill is very poorly designed to deal with this problem. We, as members of this House, should have more detail in the bill as to what it is really going to mean to the customers of motor vehicle dealers.

I hope the parliamentary assistant either can give us some assurance on these matters—that is, a binding assurance—or perhaps think about taking the bill back and writing into it some of those principles where the intent now is to establish them by regulation, which of course can then be changed at whim.

I realize some things have to be changed; we could not have everything brought back to the House, such as the amount motor vehicle dealers would have to pay. But certainly those principles could be established in this bill. The parliamentary assistant may want to think about taking the bill back and making some of those changes so it is more satisfactory to the opposition, to the government and certainly to all the people in this province who will be buying cars from motor vehicle dealers.

Mr. Mitchell: Mr. Speaker, I will do my best to answer all the questions that have been raised within the time I have available to me.

If I may comment on the extended warranty situation, I think the point is very well made. In fact, on the weekend, when I had an opportunity to speak to a group, that was an area of question by those people. I was able to say to them that it is an area of very serious concern to the minister. In answer to the concern of the minister, there have been staff discussions with Quebec. There have been, in fact, staff discussions with Quebec, in answer to the member for Cornwall (Mr. Samis), and it is expected—although I must be honest, not in this session, but perhaps within the year—that something will be put forward with regard to extended warranty.

4:10 p.m.

I am unable to do it at this time or within this bill, but it is a very serious concern and consideration in the ministry. In fact, because the question was raised with me by the Consumers' Association of Canada at their conference in Hamilton over the weekend, I have become more involved in it and I have come to appreciate the concerns the honourable member is raising. In discussions with the minister, he was quite clear on the point that it is an area in which he wants to see if there are ways of resolving the very issues the member points out.

Mr. Samis: Their legislation goes beyond just the warranty.

Mr. Mitchell: Yes. I am not arguing whose legislation is better. The staff have been down to discuss their legislation, and I am sure we will gain all the benefit of their examination of that legislation. But as I say, I cannot do it with this particular bill at this time.

To answer some of the questions that were raised earlier, I will read parts of the minister's statement:

"By way of background, the Motor Vehicle Dealers Act was set up in 1965. At that time, a \$5,000 bond posted by each of the car dealerships was enough to cover potential consumer claims, but as the industry has rightly pointed out, it is not enough today." Then the statement goes on to mention that some deposits can be as high as \$1,000 and, frankly, a \$5,000 bond would not go very far if a dealership went into bankruptcy.

With regard to questions as to how the money will be dealt with, the money will be placed in trust and administered by a board of trustees made up of industry, government and public representatives. Administrative costs will be covered by interest from the fund.

I should point out, as I said earlier, that the registration fee will be \$150 for two years. It is also proposed that when the fund reaches \$1 million, there will be a premium holiday for registered dealers; however, new dealers coming in will continue to add to the fund.

I am not sure whether I have answered them all; my time is running a little tight. I will try to ensure that all the questions that have been raised with me are answered.

The questions with regard to the turnback of odometers have been handled very well by the minister, as I am sure the members know. I believe the new licensing program of the Ministry of Transportation and Communications will also answer the concerns raised by the member for Erie (Mr. Haggerty) in that there will be a better record of those cars. As he will recall, the licence plate becomes the property of the owner, so that every time a car is transferred new plates will have to be issued one way or the other. I think that problem is addressed there.

Motion agreed to.

Bill ordered for committee of the whole House.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, as we had already agreed, I would suggest that since it is practically 4:15 p.m. perhaps at your discretion

the House might recess for 15 minutes or so until the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) is ready to present his resolution.

Mr. Speaker: It being almost 4:15 p.m., I do leave the chair. We will resume at approximately 4:30 p.m.

The House recessed at 4:15 p.m.

4:30 p.m.

BUDGET RESOLUTION

Hon. F. S. Miller moved, seconded by Hon. Mr. Davis, that this House approves in general the budgetary policy of the government.

Mr. Speaker: I ask the indulgence and the co-operation of all members please while the pages distribute the budget. Have all members received their copies of the budget? I presume they have.

BUDGET STATEMENT

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, before I begin the formal presentation of my 1983 budget this afternoon, I would like to review with the House some events of the past five or six days which relate to the budget preparation.

I know members are aware that some aspects are part of investigations relating to pending civil or criminal proceedings. All of these are outside my ministerial responsibility and are not proper for me to discuss or comment on here.

As I reported to the House on Friday, I was made aware on Thursday afternoon, May 5, that some attempts were made to breach security in Don Mills where the budget was to be produced by a commercial printing firm, under contract to maintain security with assistance from the Ontario Provincial Police. Later Thursday afternoon, two reporters from the Globe and Mail, Robert Stephens and Rosemary Speirs, came to my office in the Frost Building and showed me some printed material which they alleged formed part of the budget which I will be presenting to you shortly.

Copies of this material and stories based on it were published in Friday's Globe and Mail. The paper reported that the material was found in garbage bags which, the Globe said, a reporter took from a loading dock at Carswell's plant on Wednesday, May 4. Some members have noted that the early editions of the paper carried a picture of the dock to illustrate the source.

Following the discussion of this matter in the House on Friday morning, a lawyer representing the Globe and Mail delivered two bags of garbage from Carswell Printing Co. to the

criminal law office of the Ministry of the Attorney General. My deputy minister subsequently received a letter from Richard J. Doyle, editor of the *Globe and Mail*, which indicates that all the material taken from the printing plant was given to the Attorney General's officers. This material is now in the possession of the police and has been examined by my staff.

Apart from some industrial garbage, scrap papers and parts of material Carswell was printing for nongovernment customers, my staff tells me that the sacks appear to contain scraps of proofs of documents, three areas of which could be of interest in this discussion. Neither my budget statement nor the tax measures which I will propose later today were part of the material turned over to the police.

Some of the material relating to Ontario government activities included parts of the Management Board of Cabinet estimates for the government for the coming year which were being printed by Carswell Printing Co. under a separate contract. These were also covered by a security clause and Management Board will be pursuing this with its legal advisers.

In addition, there were seven pages of a French translation of an early draft of an appendix to the budget statement. These sheets contain statistics on estimates of expenditures and revenues and appear to be from the second draft of the material. Several subsequent revisions had been made before the *Globe and Mail* published its report.

The third piece of data used by the *Globe and Mail* was pieced together from a torn-up proof of an Ontario health insurance plan bulletin which was to be printed for the Ministry of Health to mail to subscribers today, budget day. This document was intended to advise subscribers of our intention to increase premiums by five per cent at this time and it is the one document which we have not been able to accommodate within our in-house printing capacity. It will not be ready to mail for a few days.

However, I will be proposing today to increase premiums by five per cent, in keeping with the Inflation Restraint Act which limits increases in administered prices to five per cent unless an exception is granted by the cabinet committee on administered prices.

OHIP premiums are not a tax measure or an integral part of the budget and can be changed at any time by regulation, a process which also applies to other government fees or licences. For this reason, it was both legally and technically

possible to change, drop or delay this increase. But we believe the amount and timing are justified, and in my view it would be quite improper to make any change for the sole purpose of discrediting the *Globe and Mail* report. I do not believe it is necessary for me to do that.

4:40 p.m.

To recap, the budget which I will be introducing in just a moment is based on the best economic and fiscal advice we could obtain by actively canvassing a broad range of advice both inside and outside Ontario. The major issues today, which seem to have been forgotten in all of this, are the serious economic challenges facing our province and our country in 1983. Our budget is urgently needed, and I hope it will make a contribution to meeting those challenges. It must represent our best effort and must not be something less than that or something different or delayed for the sake of expediency.

So while it is clear that the security of the critical areas of this budget was not compromised by reporters who pieced together a story from the scraps from a commercial printing plant, the precedent involved has caused us a good deal of concern about how we can protect the public interest in similar circumstances in the future.

As I said at the beginning, detailed comment on other aspects of this matter by me would be quite improper until the pending civil and criminal law questions are resolved.

I will now get on with the body of my budget. I am delighted to see over the lights in the balcony two of my predecessors, the Honourable John White and the Honourable James N. Allan, both very fine Treasurers of the past. The family treasurer from Muskoka is seated up there too in the person of my wife. Her budgets balance.

Mr. Martel: You have long promised that.

Mr. J. A. Reed: You could learn something from her.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Right.

I now present to the Legislature the details of the 1983 budget for Ontario.

The aim of this budget is to encourage and sustain the economic momentum as it gains strength. The recovery is still in its early stage and it will be important over the next few months to do what we can to assist the economy by putting into place policies conducive to

long-term growth, productivity improvement and job creation.

The recovery is being led, as it must, by the private sector. Only private enterprise can undertake the investments and create the permanent jobs upon which prosperity depends. Experience has shown that government works best when it works in co-operation with the private sector, allowing it the room and the resources it needs to do the things it does best not only for itself but for society as a whole.

Before outlining the objectives I have adopted in the 1983 budget, I would like to comment on our process of pre-budget consultation. In preparing this budget, I had extensive discussions with a large number of groups, including those representing farmers, small businessmen, teachers, workers, women, consumers and manufacturers. As well, I had meetings with other provinces, the federal government and the Association of Municipalities of Ontario. I would like to express my appreciation to all the organizations that took time to present their briefs to me. In virtually all cases their recommendations were constructive and well reasoned.

The pre-budget consultations indicated two main things to me. First, the worst of the recession is over. There is ample evidence we are now moving into a new period of economic growth. According to Statistics Canada, our industrial production jumped five per cent in January, the largest monthly increase in almost 50 years. This was followed by a further 1.7 per cent increase in February.

A Conference Board of Canada survey of business spending intentions has shown that businessmen are revising their investment spending plans because they do feel the recession is over. A consumer survey conducted by the same organization revealed a marked increase in consumer confidence in the first quarter of this year. As well, inflation is continuing to moderate in both Canada and the United States.

Equally encouraging is the news about employment. Since bottoming out last November, the number of people working in Ontario has risen by 24,000, seasonally adjusted. Employment has increased in three of the last five months and I expect that upward trend will continue.

The improving economic news makes me optimistic about Ontario's economic outlook. At the same time, I am realistic enough to recognize we are not out of the woods yet, that the hardship and suffering endured by so many during this recession have not yet been overcome. Our economy is like a patient who has

been removed from the critical list but still remains only in fair condition. Further recuperation is required before the recovery is complete.

A second broad point of consensus that emerged during the pre-budget consultative process is that government must continue to play a supportive role in nurturing the economic recovery. The views I received during the pre-budget discussions and my own analysis of the economy lead me to believe our 1983 budget can best help restore economic prosperity by seeking to achieve four objectives.

First, we must try to maintain a co-operative federal-provincial environment so that governments work in harmony to improve our economic prospects. Second, we must emphasize the creation of long-term employment through the private sector by encouraging investment and productivity improvement. Third, we must expand our short-term programs for job creation, skill development and economic growth. Fourth, we must maintain a fiscal framework that allows us to pay for our beneficial public programs without imposing excessive burdens of debt upon the people.

My budget will address each of these areas in turn. I would like first to discuss intergovernmental co-operation. In the past two years, certain policies of the federal government have created severe problems for Ontario. The November 1981 federal budget dampened investment and business prospects. This was compounded by the federal cuts in payments for health and for post-secondary education. These cutbacks cost Ontario \$288 million last year and will mean reduced revenues of \$315 million this year.

The lost funds in these past two years alone would have been enough to pay for five years' worth of hospital capital requirements. Moreover, the federal government has further compounded the problem by capping the growth of post-secondary education transfers, an action that will trim an additional \$37 million from our Ontario revenue this year.

A few weeks ago I met with the Honourable Joel Matheson, the Minister of Finance for Nova Scotia, to release a consensus provincial statement concerning this latest round of federal transfer cuts. As all the arguments are covered in detail in that statement, I will not repeat them this afternoon, but I do want to remind the members of the importance of that document. They should be aware, for example, that even under the most generous interpretation, the federal share in the funding of our health care

programs has fallen from almost 52 per cent a few years ago to 43 per cent today. In actual cash payments, their share is about 24 per cent. These disturbing statistics help to explain the fiscal difficulties we have in the area of health care financing.

While I remain critical of federal policies in the area of transfer payments, I am more encouraged by certain taxation and economic policies that have been adopted by Ottawa. Going back to last June, we saw the federal government remove some of the more onerous provisions of the November 1981 budget and provide an incentive for the purchase of new housing that was complementary to the Ontario renter-buy program. We then saw the federal government act, in the fall, to create a new short-term job creation program which, in Ontario, added to the major initiatives I had implemented earlier in the year.

I responded to this constructive action by committing \$100 million to the Canada-Ontario employment development program. I was pleased to note that in its recent budget the federal government adopted an economic stimulation program that is oriented to the private sector.

At this point I would like to mention briefly the tax collection agreement under which the federal government collects Ontario personal income tax. Last year, I indicated I was sufficiently concerned about the nature of federal changes to the personal income tax that I questioned whether Ontario should continue to be part of an agreement that compels us to parallel most federal amendments.

4:50 p.m.

Accordingly, I asked the Ontario Economic Council to study this matter for me and report back. As members know, the council has completed its study of the matter and it expresses concerns about the current process, but it recommends that Ontario stay within the tax collection agreement and not adopt its own income tax system on the assumption that the federal government can be persuaded to improve the consultative process.

I believe recently the federal government has been somewhat more willing to discuss tax changes with the provinces. Therefore, we will remain in the tax collection agreement for the time being, but we must seek continuing consultation with tangible results if we are to stay within this arrangement in the longer term.

I would like to inject one word of caution about recent federal policies and that concerns the size of the federal deficit and the length of

time it will take to reduce it to manageable levels. The Minister of Finance has attempted to address this issue by proposing tax changes but some of them will not take effect for almost 18 months. I am, quite frankly, sceptical of this approach. Fiscal reality is not something governments can put aside for another day or another budget.

Mr. Conway: Darcy McKeough promised it for 1981.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I had a surplus that year, by the way, in terms of all but the capital account. The members opposite tend to forget that. In nine of the last 12 years, we have had a surplus on operating account and have only borrowed for the capital of this province. That is all we have borrowed for.

Thank you for the interjection. Please be on cue next time.

As I have noted, Ontario's economic performance relies on a strong and vibrant private sector. To gain permanent jobs for our citizens and productivity improvements that enable us to compete in world markets, business must be willing to undertake investments in new plant and equipment. Government has an important role to play in providing a climate favourable to capital formation and long-term employment creation.

In spite of improving economic prospects, business continues to approach new investment and job creation with some caution. In this environment, selective actions by government can be instrumental in reinforcing economic recovery by encouraging the private sector to undertake new job creating investment and by ensuring that our labour force is properly trained.

Later, I will outline new initiatives to expand manpower training. Now, I am proposing the following measures to promote new investment:

Ontario will parallel recent federal actions that improve loss carryover provisions under the corporations income tax. Businesses will now be able to carry noncapital losses back three years and forward seven years for purposes of determining Ontario income tax liability. This will be effective immediately for small businesses, farmers, fisherman and phased in over the next two years for other businesses.

In addition, net capital losses will be eligible for a three-year carryback as well as for the existing indefinite carry-forward provision. These measures, which will be of particular benefit to small business, will provide \$40 million in tax relief in this fiscal year.

Turning to the issue of encouraging invest-

ment in production facilities, I have carefully examined the implications of our current retail sales tax policy. Existing provisions allow an exemption for machinery and equipment used directly in the manufacturing process. While this tax expenditure provides significant support to business investment, its scope can be enlarged.

Also, the complex nature of the production process, particularly in this era of high technology, means that the Ministry of Revenue must constantly make difficult rulings to determine the tax status of particular items of equipment. This has led to frustration and uncertainty for companies and people attempting to create new production facilities.

Consequently, I am proposing that effective midnight tonight the exemption for production machinery and equipment be expanded substantially. In addition, I propose to exempt from retail sales tax all purchases of tools and parts used for the repair and maintenance of exempt production machinery.

To complement the thrust of these investment incentives, I propose to exempt from retail sales tax the purchase of certain transportation vehicles and equipment such as heavy trucks and trailers.

With these measures, we will assist Ontario industry to improve its productivity which, in turn, will help to protect and create jobs. I estimate these measures will provide some \$95 million of additional incentives in this fiscal year.

While the capital tax plays an important role in the province's revenue structure, we have been careful to ensure that this tax represents neither an unfair burden nor a needlessly complex part of business life. Already the bulk of corporations in Ontario pay a flat tax of either \$50 or \$100. This ensures that small business, in particular, is able to cope with this tax and not only the larger corporations pay the designated rates.

Since corporations are liable for capital tax regardless of their profit position, the tax can cause difficulties during a protracted downturn in the economy when some companies simply do not have sufficient cash flow and must borrow to meet ongoing liabilities.

Farm equipment dealers, for example, have suffered more than many during the recession. I am therefore proposing to extend temporarily the flat tax provision so that corporations in an operating loss position and that have taxable

capital of between \$1 million and \$2 million will pay only \$100.

This provision will be effective for two taxation years, ending after May 10, 1983, and before May 11, 1985. I estimate that this measure will reduce provincial revenues by \$13 million this year.

I have stood in this House many times and emphasized the vital role small business plays in the Ontario economy. Last year I introduced a major incentive for small business, namely, the complete removal for two years of small business corporations income tax. Many small business people and their organizations have said this is the most important small business incentive introduced by any government anywhere in Canada for decades.

In determining the best small business policy for this budget, I was impressed with an observation in a brief I received from the Canadian Federation of Independent Business. It states that approximately 150,000 new small business ventures were born in 1982 and that 200,000 new businesses will be established this year.

"Thus," says the brief, "the dynamism of the new and young firm continues in spite of the recession. Even more now than usual it is most important to create a business environment in financing and taxation to foster additional formations and the growth" of successful new firms.

This observation has important implications when one considers the key role played by small business in creating jobs. I am proposing to extend the small business exemption from corporation income tax for one additional year. This will expand our small business incentive to a value of \$180 million this year.

Another important element of Ontario's support for small business is the small business development corporations program. For the past few years, SBDCs have been increasing the supply of equity capital available to small businesses and they have been helping them to address one of the major concerns of most small businessmen.

To date, some \$140 million has been invested under the program. Over 600 separate investments have been made by 314 small businesses in manufacturing, tourism, research and publishing. It is the single most successful venture capital program ever created in Canada.

To strengthen this program further, I have decided to increase its allocation significantly to \$30 million for 1983-84, and I am proposing to expand the application of the program by

increasing the employee limit for an eligible small business from 100 to 150 employees. To assure that the benefits from this program are distributed widely, I also propose that a limit of \$5 million be imposed on the total allowable investment by any number of SBDCs in any one small business.

I believe we must assess carefully the longer-term role of this program so this summer I intend to establish a consultative process that will allow the small business community, the accounting and legal professions, investment analysts and all other interested parties an opportunity to provide me with their views. The advice and recommendations from these parties will help me to assess whether certain changes to the current approach would ensure an even more successful program in the future.

5 p.m.

When we look at future productivity, we must keep in mind the sector that has demonstrated the greatest productivity gains in the past and continues to be one of the cornerstones of our economy. I refer, of course, to agriculture.

This government continues to be responsive to the needs of this very important sector. In 1982-83, some \$45 million was advanced to the Crop Insurance Commission of Ontario to compensate farmers for their tobacco crop losses caused by hail storms and early frost. Also, the farm adjustment assistance program, which was to expire in December 1982, was extended for one more year to help farmers facing a difficult economic situation.

In this budget I am making provision for a new beginning farmers program. It will provide up to five percentage points in interest subsidy on eligible loans to beginning farmers for a period of five years. Up to 1,000 new farmers will benefit each year. At current interest rates, this program is expected to provide \$9 million in interest subsidy in the first full year, and as much as \$135 million over five years. The details of the program will be announced in the coming weeks by my colleague the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Timbrell).

This year, funding for the regular programs of the Ministry of Agriculture and Food will be increased by 9.3 per cent. The decrease in the overall allocation for 1983-84 reflects the very high level of extraordinary expenditures which were made last year, including the \$45 million for the tobacco crop loss and an additional \$15 million for the farm tax reduction program.

Almost a decade has passed since major reforms to the Mining Tax Act were introduced.

I believe the time has come for a comprehensive review of our mining tax to ensure it is meeting its objectives of providing a fair return to the people of Ontario for nonrenewable resources, while encouraging further processing and supporting the long-term interests of the mining industry. Later this year, my colleague the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Pope) and I will announce details of how this review will be undertaken.

In the meantime, I would like to announce a modest incentive to assist our gold producers. Currently, a significant amount of the production of gold in Ontario is used in making the Canadian Maple Leaf gold coin. I propose to remove the retail sales tax from this coin to encourage its production in the face of increasing future competition.

The performance of research and development in Canada has been a topic of discussion and concern for a number of years. R and D can be an important source of competitive advantage, and society as a whole benefits from the innovation of new products and new processes. It has been argued that Canada performs poorly in this essential area compared with other countries. A budget paper I am tabling today addresses this issue. It indicates a marked improvement in R and D performance in the last few years.

I believe the tax policies and Board of Industrial Leadership and Development programs we have put in place have played a major role in this improvement. In fact, our analysis of the tax treatment of R and D in a number of jurisdictions shows Canada to be the most generous. Other studies confirm this finding. If the proposals advanced in the recent federal budget to simplify and increase the accessibility of R and D incentives are implemented, then the current international advantage for Ontario firms in the tax treatment of research and development will be reinforced.

In the face of unexpected economic adversity over the past 18 months, the Ontario economy continues to show fundamental strength. I am confident that, as we emerge from the 1982 recession, our diversified economic base will provide the foundation for a sustained period of economic growth. Nevertheless, I am keenly aware of the need to assist the recovery in its early stages and particularly to accelerate the growth of employment. Therefore, I am announcing today selective measures to stimulate consumption and expand our job creation effort.

The pace of our economic recovery will

depend a great deal on the strength of consumer demand. To encourage consumer spending and strengthen confidence, I have decided to implement a temporary program of retail sales tax exemptions for selected items.

I propose a 90-day exemption from retail sales tax on purchases of new household furniture and appliances.

Interjections.

Hon. F. S. Miller: The Premier (Mr. Davis) and I may have trouble explaining to our children, who have just bought a bunch of furniture, what that is about.

A detailed list of exempt items is included in the appendix to this statement.

This tax relief will prompt consumers to accelerate spending decisions and will have a positive impact on important sectors of the economy. By targeting narrowly on products with high Canadian content, the greatest gains in production and employment can be achieved. I estimate that this initiative, which will begin at midnight this evening and extend to August 8, 1983, will save consumers some \$55 million this year.

In addition to this tax cut, I will now announce more job creation measures and new initiatives for manpower training.

Members will recall that last May I introduced more than \$170 million in short-term job creation initiatives. These programs provided temporary jobs for nearly 45,000 Ontario citizens. In November I announced two additional programs. Ontario committed \$50 million for its own program to stimulate employment over the short term. We also agreed to co-operate with the federal government to create the Canada-Ontario employment development program. Our \$100 million was added to an equal federal commitment to make \$200 million. Private sector, municipal and nonprofit groups have quickly taken advantage of these moneys. To date, 1,800 projects, which will create more than 15,000 temporary jobs, have been approved.

In his recent budget the federal Minister of Finance said more funds would be allocated to job creation programs. I am prepared to provide provincial funds to match that new commitment for the COED program by the federal government if it is willing.

I would like now to announce another new job creation initiative. It is an accelerated capital works program involving \$247 million worth of projects, which will create 12,000 jobs. The projects have been advanced from the longer-range plans of ministries so that they can

proceed now while the economy needs additional stimulus. Construction will take place over the next two years, and in some cases local governments will contribute a portion of the funding. This capital works program, which is targeted primarily at regions of the province with higher levels of unemployment, will be co-ordinated by BILD. Details will be announced over the next few weeks by my colleagues.

Youth employment has for many years been a priority of this government. In 1982, our programs provided temporary jobs for 75,000 young people. I have decided to increase the 1983 allocation for youth employment by \$36 million to bring the total for this year to \$121 million. This will provide 100,000 jobs for Ontario's youth.

As part of this expansion, I am allocating \$25 million for a new, accelerated youth employment program. It will provide a wage subsidy of \$100 per week for up to 20 weeks to employers who add unemployed young people to their payrolls. A portion of the expenditure will be targeted to recent graduates of post-secondary institutions. I anticipate this new program will create 12,500 jobs.

5:10 p.m.

I turn now to the important issue of manpower training. Earlier, I announced measures to create long-term employment opportunities through initiatives to encourage investment and to stimulate productivity growth. Equipping our people with appropriate skills makes a major contribution to economic development and to that productivity improvement; more important, it gives individuals the opportunity to pursue productive and rewarding employment.

I have decided to allocate a further \$14 million to BILD this year to expand skill development programs in Ontario. Existing programs will be supplemented and funding will be provided for new programs to encourage employers to accelerate their hiring plans and to create new jobs and training opportunities. I am pleased to note that one of these programs will be of particular benefit to women interested in entering technical occupations.

Further details of these new manpower training initiatives will be announced by my colleague the Minister of Colleges and Universities (Miss Stephenson).

I turn now to the housing sector. The Ontario renter-buy program, introduced in the 1982 budget, proved very successful in promoting new home purchases and creating rental unit vacancies. More than 15,000 new home buyers

will have received assistance under this program, with a total provincial commitment of more than \$75 million. The program made a major contribution to the recovery of the housing sector.

I expect this momentum to continue in 1983, because new starts will be encouraged by lower mortgage interest rates and improving economic prospects. The preliminary data for the first quarter of 1983 are very encouraging and support a forecast of 53,000 new housing starts for the year, an increase of 38 per cent over the 1982 level.

While I am encouraged by these indications, I believe we do need to provide a degree of stimulus in the rental sector. Therefore, I am proposing this afternoon a \$40-million stimulative package aimed at creating and improving the stock of rental accommodation in the province. This new initiative will assist in the rehabilitation and construction of more than 5,000 units, representing 12,000 jobs in construction and related activities. I expect the full amount will be committed this year and that cash flow for this year also will be \$16 million. The details of the program will be announced by my colleague the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Mr. Bennett).

Before turning to our revenue requirements for this year, I would like to review briefly some highlights of our expenditure program for 1983-84.

In these difficult times, one of our highest priorities must be to provide our people with a sense of security about the availability of fundamental programs that provide support to the individual and the family. In 1983-84, \$10 billion will be spent on health care and social services, well over \$1,000 per citizen.

We will introduce improvements to treatment centres for the physically handicapped children in a number of communities throughout Ontario. Almost 500 new beds will be opened for the aged and the chronically ill. Last fall, we introduced a special program costing almost \$70 million to provide additional social assistance throughout 1983-84 to people most severely affected by the recession.

Our total spending on education this year will be \$5.5 billion, an average of about \$1,800 for each young person in the province. In recognition of the increasing importance of computers in society, the Ministry of Education is working with school boards to provide software packages for use in elementary and secondary schools. There are now about 7,000 microcomputers in publicly supported schools in Ontario.

New capital spending on our education system will be \$116 million this year. This will emphasize our priority on technological training, with expansions or new facilities in Sault Ste. Marie, Oshawa and Guelph. The province has also decided to proceed with the natural resources centre at the University of Toronto.

In special education programs the province has increased funding by 16 per cent to \$260 million in 1983-84. Last fall a third demonstration school for children with severe learning disabilities was opened. To provide assistance to students, funding for the Ontario student assistance program will be increased by \$9.6 million to \$119.4 million in 1983-84. This program helps approximately 90,000 students in the province every year.

Dans le cadre de la stratégie à long terme du gouvernement destinée à préserver et à mettre en valeur nos ressources naturelles, le ministère des Richesses naturelles signera huit nouvelles ententes de gestion forestière cette année. Le Programme ontarien d'exploration minière devrait rapporter \$30 millions grâce aux activités d'exploration en 1983-84. Jusqu'ici, plus de 450 projets d'aide à l'exploration minière ont été désignés, ce qui représente près de \$90 millions de dépenses d'exploration. Ce programme a déjà permis de créer 2,000 nouveaux emplois et a joué un rôle majeur dans les importantes découvertes d'or à Hemlo et à Sturgeon Lake.

Le gouvernement continuera à améliorer l'accès aux ressources en construisant et en ouvrant cette année plus de 1,800 kilomètres de routes d'accès dans le Nord. En 1983-84, norOntair assurera des liaisons régulières entre 21 communautés du Nord de l'Ontario grâce à neuf avions qui parcourront, selon les estimations, environ 1,564,000 milles. Et le programme rail-transversier de la Commission des transports du Nord de l'Ontario assurera un service à 380,000 passagers en 1983-84.

The province will expand its efforts to promote exports of Ontario products this year. The allocation for the programs of the Ministry of Industry and Trade will be increased by 15 per cent. However, because of the \$75-million payment in 1982-83 to meet our commitment for the Massey-Ferguson assistance plan, the actual dollar estimates of the ministry will be lower.

Since it was created two and a half years ago, the Board of Industrial Leadership and Development has devoted \$407 million to support economic development. Over 80 new programs and initiatives have been funded. In 1983-84 BILD will invest over \$50 million in the recently

established centres for the promotion of new technologies and advanced applied research, including the six technology centres, the Innovation Development for Employment Advancement Corp., the fusion fuel technology project and the Allelix Biotechnology Co.

BILD will provide the universities and community and agricultural colleges with \$21 million worth of high-tech equipment and training support and direct over \$40 million to initiatives in the agricultural, forestry and mineral sectors to upgrade resources, intensify renewal efforts and promote technological advancement.

5:20 p.m.

I have now outlined special job creation measures and some highlights of our overall expenditure program. Another of the great strengths of this province is the reputation of its government for good financial management. We intend to continue to meet our responsibilities to existing and future citizens. Accordingly, the bulk of the stimulation programs I announced earlier must be financed by revenue increases, which I shall now discuss.

Before discussing tax measures, let me turn to Ontario health insurance plan premiums. The province of Ontario commits over 32 cents out of every spending dollar to health care. This fact alone means that even modest percentage increases in health spending can create significant revenue requirements. While OHIP premiums provide an important source of funds, the growth of health care expenditures has outstripped premiums in recent years. Five years ago they paid for 23 per cent of health spending; this declined to just 19 per cent last year.

Last May I released a paper that examined the possibility of addressing part of this problem by replacing OHIP premiums with a payroll tax. I have received a number of briefs concerning this paper, most of which express doubts about the wisdom of introducing a new payroll tax. I intend to heed this advice and I do not intend to proceed with any further study or discussion of the payroll tax concept at this time.

This year premiums occupy a unique place in our revenue structure because they are an administered price and therefore are subject to the provincial restraint program. While this program allows for cost pass-through and therefore a double-digit premium increase could be justified, I believe the overall credibility of the inflation restraint program could be harmed if such an increase were permitted to go through.

Consequently, I decided to restrain the increase of our OHIP premiums to five per cent this year.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. F. S. Miller: This modest monthly increase of \$1.35 for single persons and \$2.70 for family coverage will yield \$60 million in additional revenues. I need not remind the members that 70 per cent of OHIP premiums are paid by employers.

I also propose that additional revenues may be obtained from beverage alcohol by increasing the retail sales tax from 10 to 12 per cent on purchases of beverage alcohol at retail stores. Purchases at licensed establishments will remain taxable at 10 per cent. This increase will be effective May 24, 1983. Members can stock up.

It is estimated that \$31 million in additional revenue will be generated from this measure, with price increases amounting to about 20 cents per bottle of average-priced spirits, 10 cents per bottle of popular wines and 15 cents per case of 12 bottles of beer.

I am also proposing to increase revenue from the taxation of tobacco. First, I am proposing that the ad valorem tobacco tax rate be increased from 40 to 45 per cent for cigarettes and cut tobacco. Cigars will stay the same.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That includes pipes.

Hon. F. S. Miller: They are already at 45 per cent.

Second, a seven per cent Ontario retail sales tax will be applied to all tobacco products. The retail sales tax will be levied in addition to the tobacco tax and will be applied to the retail selling price, inclusive of such tax. This will mean that the taxation of tobacco products is more consistent with our treatment of other products. I anticipate that these measures, effective midnight tonight, will raise additional revenues of some \$135 million.

I now turn to the corporations income tax. As a paper accompanying this budget shows, Ontario's taxation policies provide a balance between the taxation of individuals and corporations, while ensuring that taxes on business are consistent with our economic growth prospects and with the realities of international competition. With this in mind, I have determined that it is fair and affordable for the corporate sector, along with individuals, to help maintain the essential services our people require.

Therefore, I am proposing that the general rate of corporations income tax be increased from 14 per cent to 15 per cent, while the rate on

income from manufacturing and processing operations, mining, logging, farming and fishing be increased from 13 per cent to 14 per cent. This change will apply to taxation years of corporations ending after May 10, 1983, and will generate an additional \$70 million of the expected total revenue increase from corporations income tax of \$255 million. Small business income, as noted earlier, will continue to be exempt.

I would like to announce one additional temporary tax measure which will be necessary to assist in the financing of our public programs and new initiatives for job creation. Beginning July 1, 1983, and continuing through the 1984 tax year, a five per cent surcharge on Ontario personal income tax will be collected. It will be called the social services maintenance tax.

Mr. Wrye: That's great stuff.

Mr. R. F. Johnston: Four dollars an hour and one gets taxed. That is great. That is a great plan.

Mr. Breithaupt: Call it the Suncor tax.

Interjections.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I borrowed that from the New Democratic Party. They told me to do it. That is exactly what they said.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Lower-income Ontarians will be protected since the surcharge will apply only to Ontario taxpayers with taxable income in excess of \$2,178 this year. As a result, some 500,000 taxpayers will not pay this tax. For those who are affected, the average tax increase amounts to about \$1.40 per week. Over two million of these taxpayers will, in fact, pay less than \$1 per week in increased income tax.

This means that those citizens of Ontario who have jobs will contribute a modest additional amount to ensure that decent public programs and job creation initiatives are paid for without undue increases in our deficit. This measure will yield \$170 million in this fiscal year.

Details of the tax measures I have announced this afternoon, as well as a number of additional retail sales tax changes of a technical nature, can be found in appendix A to this statement. Legislation to enact these measures will be brought forward by my colleague the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Ashe).

Now that I have outlined the major actions of this budget, let me move to my forecast for the Ontario economy. As I said earlier, there are encouraging indications of economic recovery.

Inflation has decelerated significantly since the middle of 1982. Public sector wage and price restraint and a favourable outlook for food and energy prices will, we believe, cause this trend to continue. Industrial production has risen in the latest two months for which data are available. Interest rates are at their lowest levels in three years and seasonally adjusted employment in Ontario has increased by 24,000 since the low point of last November.

Real growth in gross provincial product should average 1.9 per cent for 1983. While modest by historical standards, this is a massive improvement from last year. Employment will be on an upward trend throughout the year. I expect the number of people employed in Ontario by the fourth quarter of 1983 will be 65,000 above the level in the fourth quarter of 1982. The consumer price index is forecast to rise by 6.6 per cent, the lowest annual increase since 1972.

5:30 p.m.

Last fall I introduced the legislation required for the inflation restraint program which is a key element in our efforts to foster economic recovery. This program was essential. The private sector, already hard hit by the recession, could not be expected to pay for unwarranted growth in government expenditures.

During these difficult times, the program holds the costs of government down in two ways. First, compensation increases have been limited for over 1.5 million employees in the broadly defined provincial public sector. Second, restrictions are placed on increases in prices set or directly authorized by Ontario ministries or agencies.

By keeping its own house in order, the Ontario government has made an important contribution to the reduction of inflation, both directly through cost and price restraint and indirectly by providing leadership to others. In this manner, the restraint program has made a constructive contribution to moderation in the rate of inflation. This moderation is expected to continue over the next year; unit labour cost increases have decelerated and, as I indicated earlier, our inflation outlook is favourable.

While the measures contained in this budget will help to restore economic prosperity, much remains to be done. Ontario's job losses over the past couple of years have been high and unemployment has risen to completely unacceptable levels. Ontario's public sector workers largely have been sheltered from those events. In part, this is due to the design of our restraint program. When it became necessary to make an extraor-

dinary effort to hold costs down, the choice was made to preserve employment by placing limits on wage increases rather than requiring major layoffs. I might also point out that with declining inflation a five per cent wage increase is not that bad.

Looking ahead, fiscal realities make it essential to continue to constrain government expenditures. Wage demands in the public sector must continue to moderate. Otherwise, it simply may not be possible to maintain the degree of job security in the future that has been provided to date. Public agencies, municipalities, boards of education, universities, colleges and hospitals—indeed, all bodies financed largely through tax dollars—must be expected to show restraint in their compensation plans. Recipients of provincial funds should not anticipate future increases at levels above, or even at, the rate of inflation.

I should also note that restraint is not a matter for the public sector alone. Recovery will require everyone, whether in the private or public sector, to restrain his demands for higher wages and prices.

Nor can our efforts to constrain government spending be limited to wage restraint. We need to examine carefully all aspects of our expenditures to determine where we can find further improvements in savings or efficiencies. While Ontario's record in holding the line on government expenditure is well known, we intend to redouble our efforts. To do this, we have created a formal program review process to examine all provincial programs to see where savings can be achieved.

As part of this review, each ministry will undertake a thorough reassessment of its programs and priorities and recommend to cabinet where expenditures can be reduced. This exercise will apply to all ministries, including my own. In this regard, I have questioned the usefulness of continuing the Ontario property tax credit now that comprehensive property tax reform has been postponed indefinitely and local taxes account for a lower percentage of personal income than they did in the early 1970s.

Before concluding, I would like to discuss briefly the Canada pension plan. As Treasurer, I constantly must balance the desirability of increasing social benefits with the need to ensure that such increases are not only adequately financed but also delivered through the most appropriate vehicle. These concerns have influenced our reaction to proposals to amend the Canada pension plan and to explain why the govern-

ment of Ontario has not ratified the so-called child-rearing drop-out amendment.

However, it is clear from the many representations that have been made to the government, particularly from the Ontario Status of Women Council, that the drop-out amendment has the widespread approval of people across Canada. Because of this fact, and with the desire to promote a spirit of goodwill in the pension reform process, the government of Ontario will set aside its longstanding reservations and will remove its veto of the CPP drop-out amendment.

Tomorrow I will initiate the process of formally notifying the federal government of Ontario's decision. Later this year, the new minister with responsibility for women's issues will elaborate further on pension reform measures that will be beneficial to women.

Let me now conclude this budget by summarizing our financial position. A brief review of the past fiscal year again shows this government's sound financial stewardship. The record shows our actual expenditures and revenues were both within 0.7 per cent of the original budget estimates I tabled last May. We accomplished this during one of the most difficult years in the post-war era. This kind of management record is second to none. Moreover, in 1982-83 our deficit in relation to output was the lowest of any province in Canada.

During the course of the previous year, we responded to the many economic and social pressures with in-year expenditure increases of \$728 million. These were financed mainly by \$562 million in offsets from existing programs. As a result, total expenditures went up by \$166 million, or less than one per cent. This enviable expenditure management record was achieved by my colleague the Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet (Mr. McCague).

In 1982-83 we allowed cash reserves to decline rather than borrow at record high interest rates. These reserves will be replenished through an orderly borrowing program in a market that now has more advantageous rates. The recession has also had a considerable impact on government revenues, but overall our revenues were within \$150 million of the original forecast. Details of our financial accounts and our in-year changes are presented in appendix C.

In the 1983-84 fiscal year, total provincial revenue is estimated to grow by 7.9 per cent to more than \$22 billion. I think Mr. Allan had the first billion-dollar budget, and we have multiplied that a bit. This revenue performance reflects both the forecast upswing of economic

activity and the revenue measures I have announced. Provincial spending is expected to grow by 7.7 per cent to \$24.7 billion in the current fiscal year. This rate of growth is below that projected for the provincial product.

5:40 p.m.

I have outlined certain revenue measures and the program review process that we have set in place to find ways of further improving government efficiency. I have also indicated that last year we were able to find significant in-year savings. This year I am setting a target now of \$300 million of in-year expenditure savings yet to be identified.

Mr. Foulds: What does that mean? All you cabinet ministers applaud that.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Cabinet is sadly lacking in its applause for that one.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. F. S. Miller: In other words, I believe our total expenditures can be reduced by \$300 million, and this has been incorporated in our net cash requirements projection. These savings are essentially applied to the job creation programs described earlier.

I estimate net cash requirements for 1983-84 to be \$2,695 million. When this deficit is projected in relation to the gross provincial product, it will be lower than last year's level. It will be financed by \$2,080 million from nonpublic sources, with the balance from public capital markets.

Of the projected \$1 billion to be borrowed publicly, \$267 million will be used to retire maturing debt and \$118 million will be used to augment the province's liquid reserves. Further details of our fiscal plan are appended to the statement.

Pour conclure, M. le Président, je suis certain que les politiques énoncées dans ce budget soutiendront l'économie ontarienne dans la voie du redressement et de la prospérité à long terme.

Ce budget favorise la coopération fédérale-provinciale.

Il maintient l'augmentation des dépenses gouvernementales en dessous du taux de croissance de l'économie.

Il stimule les investissements des entreprises et la création d'emplois.

Il contrôle le déficit.

Il limite l'augmentation des primes d'assurance-maladie à cinq pour cent.

Il accélère la mise en chantier de nouveaux travaux d'immobilisations d'une valeur de \$247 millions.

Il crée 100,000 emplois cette année pour les jeunes.

Il lance des mesures pour améliorer la formation de la main-d'œuvre.

Il aide les jeunes agriculteurs et les locataires.

Il offre un encouragement fiscal immédiat pour l'achat d'appareils ménagers et d'ameublement.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I am confident the policies in this budget will assist the Ontario economy on its path to recovery and long-term prosperity.

[Applause]

Hon. F. S. Miller: You can applaud longer. I am running slow.

This budget fosters federal-provincial co-operation.

It holds the increase in government spending below the growth rate of the economy.

It stimulates business investment and job creation.

It holds the deficit in check.

It limits Ontario health insurance plan premiums to a five per cent increase.

It accelerates \$247 million of new capital projects.

It creates 100,000 jobs for youth this year.

It initiates measures to improve manpower training.

It helps young farmers and renters.

It provides an immediate tax incentive for the purchase of appliances and furniture.

This budget continues to build upon our record of rock-solid financial stewardship. It is a budget that will assist the restoration of growth and prosperity in our beloved Ontario, a province that will long continue to profit from the leadership of the Premier (Mr. Davis).

Mr. T. P. Reid: Mr. Speaker, we would be interested in seeing the budget the Treasurer would have presented if the Premier had moved on to greener fields.

On motion by Mr. T. P. Reid, the debate was adjourned.

The House adjourned at 5:47 p.m.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, May 10, 1983

Oral questions

Bennett, Hon. C. F., Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing:	
Allocation of housing units , Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Roy.	624
Elgie, Hon. R. G., Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations:	
Price restraint monitoring , Mr. Swart.	622
Grossman, Hon. L. S., Minister of Health:	
Psychiatric services for adolescents , Mr. Van Horne.	621
McMurtry, Hon. R. R., Attorney General:	
Security of tenure in rental units , Mr. Philip, Mr. Kolyn.	622
Salford landfill site , Mr. Elston.	626
Ramsay, Hon. R. H., Minister of Labour:	
Diesel emissions , Mr. Martel, Mr. Wildman.	619
Lead assessments at Wilco-Canada , Mr. Martel, Ms. Copps.	620
Workers' Compensation Board , Mr. Di Santo, Ms. Copps.	626
Sterling, Hon. N. W., Provincial Secretary for Justice:	
Freedom of information , Mr. Breithaupt, Mr. Stokes.	617
Timbrell, Hon. D. R., Minister of Agriculture and Food:	
Assistance to farmers , Mr. McKessock.	623
Welch, Hon. R. S., Minister of Energy and Deputy Premier:	
Hydro contracts , Mr. Sargent.	622
Wells, Hon. T. L., Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs:	
Constitutional accord , Mr. Roy, Mr. Cassidy.	617

Petitions

Kickboxing and full-contact karate , Mr. Breithaupt, tabled.	628
Annual report, Ministry of Natural Resources , Mr. J. A. Reed, tabled.	628
Education taxes , Ms. Copps, tabled.	628

First readings

Landlord and Tenant Amendment Act , Bill 32, Mr. McMurtry, agreed to.	628
Good Samaritan Act , Bill 33, Mr. Haggerty, agreed to.	629

Committee of the whole House

Toronto Futures Exchange Act , Bill 7, Mr. Elgie, Mr. Mitchell, Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Breithaupt, Mr. McGuigan, reported.	629
--	-----

Second reading

Motor Vehicle Dealers Amendment Act , Bill 3, Mr. Elgie, Mr. Mitchell, Mr. Breithaupt, Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Haggerty, Mr. Samis, Mr. McGuigan, Mr. Swart, agreed to.	632
--	-----

Budget

Budget resolution , Mr. F. S. Miller.	639
Budget statement , Mr. F. S. Miller.	639

Other business

Explanatory statements , Mr. Nixon.	629
Adjournment	650

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Bennett, Hon. C. F., Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Ottawa South PC)
 Breithaupt, J. R. (Kitchener L)
 Cassidy, M. (Ottawa Centre NDP)
 Conway, S. G. (Renfrew North L)
 Copps, S. M. (Hamilton Centre L)
 Cousens, D., Deputy Chairman and Acting Speaker (York Centre PC)
 Cureatz, S. L., Deputy Speaker and Chairman (Durham East PC)
 Di Santo, O. (Downsview NDP)
 Elgie, Hon. R. G., Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (York East PC)
 Elston, M. J. (Huron-Bruce L)
 Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP)
 Grossman, Hon. L. S., Minister of Health (St. Andrew-St. Patrick PC)
 Haggerty, R. (Erie L)
 Johnston, R. F. (Scarborough West NDP)
 Kerrio, V. G. (Niagara Falls L)
 Kolyn, A. (Lakeshore PC)
 Laughren, F. (Nickel Belt NDP)
 Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
 McGuigan, J. F. (Kent-Elgin L)
 McKessock, R. (Grey L)
 McMurtry, Hon. R. R., Attorney General (Eglinton PC)
 Miller, Hon. F. S., Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics (Muskoka PC)
 Mitchell, R. C. (Carleton PC)
 Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
 Philip, E. T. (Etobicoke NDP)
 Ramsay, Hon. R. H., Minister of Labour (Sault Ste. Marie PC)
 Reed, J. A. (Halton-Burlington L)
 Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L-Lab.)
 Rotenberg, D. (Wilson Heights PC)
 Roy, A. J. (Ottawa East L)
 Samis, G. R. (Cornwall NDP)
 Sargent, E. C. (Grey-Bruce L)
 Sterling, Hon. N. W., Provincial Secretary for Justice (Carleton-Grenville PC)
 Stokes, J. E. (Lake Nipigon NDP)
 Swart, M. L. (Welland-Thorold NDP)
 Taylor, Hon. G. W., Solicitor General (Simcoe Centre PC)
 Timbrell, Hon. D. R., Minister of Agriculture and Food (Don Mills PC)
 Turner, Hon. J. M., Speaker (Peterborough PC)
 Van Horne, R. G. (London North L)
 Welch, Hon. R. S., Minister of Energy and Deputy Premier (Brock PC)
 Wells, Hon. T. L., Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Scarborough North PC)
 Wildman, B. (Algoma NDP)
 Wrye, W. M. (Windsor-Sandwich L)



Hansard

Official Report of Debates

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Third Session, 32nd Parliament

Thursday, May 12, 1983

Afternoon Sitting

Speaker: Honourable John M. Turner

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

Contents of the proceedings reported in this issue of Hansard appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of the speakers taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is \$15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, Information Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 965-2238.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Thursday, May 12, 1983

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

ESTIMATES

Hon. Mr. McCague: Mr. Speaker, I have a message from the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor signed by his own hand.

Mr. Speaker: The Lieutenant Governor transmits estimates of certain sums required for the services of the province for the year ending March 31, 1984, and recommends them to the Legislative Assembly. Signed under his own hand, Toronto, May 12, 1983.

ESTIMATES TIMETABLE

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that after the usual consultation I am tabling the sequence, location and time allocations for this year's estimates, which members will, I expect, find attached to today's Hansard and tomorrow's Orders and Notices [see appendix, page 691].

VISITOR

Mr. Williams: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege: Before we start the question period, I would like to draw to your attention that we have in the Speaker's gallery with us today a former member of the Legislature, a quiet-spoken, introverted member who used to represent Eglinton riding, Len Reilly.

Mr. Speaker: It is always a pleasure to welcome one of my constituents as well.

ORAL QUESTIONS

JOB CREATION

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, I will let the Treasurer take his seat. I have a question concerning his budget. It deals with unemployment or employment, depending on how one wants to talk about it. The Treasurer prefers to talk about employment, even though many other people see the problem in terms of unemployment. In any event, his prediction in his budget is that 1983 will be some 65,000 above the level for the fourth quarter of 1982 in terms of employment. However, employment growth will not begin to reduce the number of unem-

ployed unless it exceeds the labour force growth, as I am sure he will agree.

The budget forecast labour force growth of some 56,000, year over year in our estimate would mean an increase of some 86,000 in terms of fourth quarter to fourth quarter. When one nets that out, what it says, according to the minister's figures, is that fourth quarter over fourth quarter he is going to have 20,000 more unemployed people. What that says is we are not keeping pace in terms of unemployment; we are going backwards. Why would he consider his budget an adequate response to this most critical problem?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I tried to point out we reached the trough of the recession somewhere between November and December. It was during December that the number of employed started to grow. I realize we can play with the employed and the unemployed. I can only use one as a given constant or sure figure, and that is the number at work. The number in the work force tends to move in and out according to a number of factors.

As the member correctly stated, the 65,000 is what we currently estimate to be the improvement December over December. I suspect the 56,000 he talks about is mid-year over mid-year. I would have to compare the December over December figures to check them to see if they coincide with the same time frames. We estimated 1.2 per cent growth in the work force this year, if I am not wrong, and we have roughly 4.5 million in the work force at the present time. Does that sound right to the member? So we are not far off. One per cent would be 45,000. I think his figure of 56,000 is about right.

Over almost the last decade, Ontario has coped with a faster-than-world growth rate in the labour force. It is just now starting to taper off as the baby boom moves through the work force. I suspect in two or three years the natural growth in the work force will start to decline below the one per cent figure. I can only say we are doing our best—and we are doing our best—to stimulate jobs in the private sector and to give some short-term training and jobs, particularly to the group that is between 20 and 29 where unemployment is heaviest.

Mr. Peterson: Even with the minister's stimulation programs for the private sector and small business, and even with his direct job creation program—taking all that into account and using any figures he wants to use, be it year by year or quarter by quarter—we are going to have more unemployed people in 1983 than we did in 1982. Fourth quarter to fourth quarter there will be 20,000 more unemployed young people.

According to the statistical rates, it was a 9.8 per cent average in 1982. The minister's figures say 11.7 per cent overall in 1983, an increase in real numbers of some 93,000 more unemployed in 1983 than in 1982. When one compares that with his so-called job creation program, netting out the carryovers and netting out some of the strange allocations, he has increased his funding in direct terms by some 5.1 per cent.

Surely, given the magnitude of this problem, this is not an adequate response to this most severe problem which, according to him, is going to stay with us for some considerable length of time in the future.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I did not detect a question, Mr. Speaker.

2:10 p.m.

Mr. Cooke: Mr. Speaker, because the Treasurer tells us and we accept that the number of people entering the work force in Ontario is going to be growing rapidly, and since the vast majority of those people are young people and we already have over 200,000 young people unemployed in this province, I would like to ask the Treasurer how he can possibly justify putting only \$36 million more into youth employment in this province and only 28,000 new jobs. That is a blasted disgrace. How can he justify it to the young people of this province?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I am sure I would be as happy as the member for Windsor-Riverside to see all those problems disappear. I suggest we are taking what I consider ample and important measures.

The member tends to forget there are two levels of government working on this. One of the reasons I took some time—and I said I would take some time bringing my budget in—was to complement what I hoped were federal measures. I believe there are some there.

I do not like the projection of unemployed that we currently have; I sincerely hope it will turn out to be wrong. I assume at the moment it is correct because I have no better figures to

offer, but we are doing our best at this difficult time to solve those problems.

Mr. Peterson: I suggest the Treasurer is not doing his best. He is forecasting higher unemployment and he is passively accepting that. There are a lot of credibility problems with respect to the last forecast, of which I will remind the Treasurer.

He told us a year ago that employment would increase by 125,000; in fact it fell by 209,000, a difference of some 334,000 jobs. After he told us the government would spend \$91 million on youth unemployment last year to create 93,000 jobs, he in fact spent considerably less than that and created only some 75,000 jobs.

How does the Treasurer expect us to take his forecast seriously when we remind him of his old forecast? I remind him that in November he told us the Canada-Ontario employment development program would create some 30,000 jobs in his budget, and the ministry now tells us it created fewer than 24,000 jobs.

The Treasurer said the \$50-million supplementary employment stimulation fund would be completely spent by March 31, 1983, and now we are informed it is a two-year program and only \$30 million was spent last year.

How can we take even his very pessimistic forecast seriously this year when he was so absolutely wrong in every respect for the last year?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I suppose that is the very reason the Leader of the Opposition should be encouraged. If my forecasting is so bad, perhaps I have overestimated the unemployed. Did he ever stop to think of that? He is not willing to accept them when I make good forecasts; why is he so willing to accept them when they are bad?

CONSUMER CONFIDENCE

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, I have another question for the Treasurer, and it deals with his philosophy of the budget, his view with respect to the importance of stimulating or at least not hindering a return to consumer confidence. This was acknowledged in the throne speech where it said: "Nothing will offer a surer sign of improving economic conditions than the decision by individual consumers to enter the marketplace."

It seems to me the Treasurer has gone out on his way in his budget to abort any so-called consumer-led recovery. Granted he has given some \$55 million in sales tax remissions for a short period of time, but while he gives \$1 i

selected areas, he has taken \$7 out of the consumers' hides.

How can he possibly have a consumer-led recovery when he has these very high tax increases on top and he is taking away a lot of disposable income that could theoretically be spent in this consumer-led recovery? How does he reconcile what he has done with the philosophy that he has articulated?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, for a person who lectures me regularly on the size of my deficit, I am surprised the Leader of the Opposition did not take the time to review the care with which the taxes were chosen and the fact that even though the temptation to go to a larger deficit was real, we have shown what most observers in the financial community and the business community have said is a proper balance in a difficult year.

I wish the member could sit, as I did this morning, in the room where the hot line is, where we are answering questions from the public. He would find that indeed the public does believe that \$55 million will spur it into making some purchases for furniture. He would find there are very few complaints about this year's budget and that this time around our office has received nothing but calls of congratulations about the budget, one that he is trying to make look bad.

Mr. Peterson: I used to think this was a government led by public opinion polls; now I find out it is a government led by hot-line shows.

How can the Treasurer go on maintaining he is going to have some kind of consumer-led recovery in the light of the statistics I have given him and considering the overwhelming critical opinion, as expressed in the comment that it seems to contradict other measures that make the outcome more uncertain? He is operating at cross purposes. He cannot stimulate by taking away more than he is giving.

Given the fact that the federal Minister of Finance gave him a little lead last week by deferring some of his tax increases until the recovery took hold, why would the Treasurer not follow that lead, if he feels obliged to raise taxes, and defer that for some period of time in the hope that this consumer-led recovery will take some hold on the economy?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I have a couple of points, Mr. Speaker. I think the Leader of the Opposition should look at the most recent sales for department stores in Canada and he will find they have a real growth this year in the latest

months shown. It is one of the most encouraging signs we have had about the consumer-led recovery. He should also look at the fact that most of our major automobile manufacturers currently have most of their employees called back, which is an indication of a return to consumer buying.

I suggest the Leader of the Opposition should recognize those facts and realize that things are coming along, rather than dampen that by his kinds of actions. We did nothing on the consumer tax front. We taxed the savings side and the personal income tax; and cut off the tax at \$2,178 taxable, leaving 500,000 families in Ontario not taxed, or 500,000 taxpayers not taxed, on that surcharge. That is not considered improper taxation technique.

I would also ask, if he is so proud of the delays in Ottawa, is he just as proud of the \$31-billion deficit the federal government has?

Mr. Cooke: Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the Treasurer the reason he has only been getting positive calls into his office is that I think he only has one line and it is connected to John Bulloch's office.

I would like to ask the Treasurer whether he realizes, when he mentions the auto sector and says everybody is back to work, that there have been about 35,000 jobs lost in that sector and those people do not have any recall rights any longer.

Does he not also realize that this five per cent surcharge will in fact hurt consumer demand? It takes income away from those people who can least afford to pay that extra tax. Why did he not take a look at other kinds of taxes to distribute fairly the cost of this recession—in other words, tax those people at the highest income level who are not sharing the burden of this recession?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, my friend in the New Democratic Party is trying to draw a fine line. It is true he recommended a surcharge on personal income tax, is it not?

Mr. Rae: Over what amount?

Mr. R. F. Johnston: Thirty-thousand dollars.

Hon. F. S. Miller: We differed with his amount, but it is a tax he recommended.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if one of the people who called in on the Treasurer's hot line was the Minister of Industry and Trade (Mr. Walker). Is the Treasurer aware that his colleague the Minister of Industry and Trade said following the budget, "I don't think taxpayers can take a great deal more without a revolt and it won't take much more to cultivate one"?

Does the Treasurer not think the tax increases he is imposing on consumers, including a 2.4 per cent personal income tax hike disguised as a surtax, will push those very same taxpayers his colleague was talking about to the very brink of revolt?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, my colleague tells me he was talking about Quebec.

2:20 p.m.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I admit that about April 29 each year I feel very much like revolting when I send a cheque to myself, and I suppose all of us who are human feel that way.

All I would say is that, compared to many jurisdictions in the world, we are very fortunate people in Ontario (a) to have a good government, (b) to have good services and (c) to have relatively fair tax systems.

BUDGET MEASURES

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, the Treasurer has told us in his budget that there are going to be fewer people working in 1983 than in 1982. He has told us real consumer spending will be up by less than two per cent, which is "a lower rate than in most previous recoveries." He has said there will be "a further reduction in the level of business investment in fixed capital" in the private sector in Ontario.

Given those three very basic, very straightforward facts, which describe an economy in the grips of a deep recession, how can the Treasurer possibly justify the two main features of his budget, which are, first of all, that taxes are now rising at a more rapid rate than expenditures; and second, that in real dollar terms there has been a very significant decline in public investment and job creation in Ontario? How can he possibly justify those kinds of measures, which are going to do nothing to create jobs and in fact are going to take away jobs from the people of this province?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, my friend the leader of the New Democratic Party does believe somehow that one can deliver services without ever paying for them, without ever taxing. We do not believe that on this side, and that is one of the reasons this government has done such a good job of maintaining its credibility in the world financial markets. We really do not accept the socialist jingoism that there is some way of giving everybody in the world something without in fact destroying the monetary system.

We simply believe we have to tell the facts the way they are. Sure, I would like to put facts in there saying there are more jobs, but we say there will be fewer jobs in total on average this year. Is that dishonest? I should hope that if we show not as rosy a picture, it may be accepted as real.

But the fact remains that the trend is up; that is the fact that is important. The 1.9 per cent real growth is our best estimation. It is based on the current, true, real interest rate of about five per cent.

The honourable member knows and I know that traditionally at the beginning of a recovery interest rates are negative in real terms. It is an exceptionally high rate. It can be changed dramatically by a change in American interest rates. It may happen; it may not. We have assumed it will not; therefore, we have tempered our rate of growth.

I would suggest to the member that it is pretty normal when capacity is running at 60 to 70 per cent that the investment side is not very active. Investment will not come into the economy until the recovery is well under way; I am sure he knows that as a student of economics.

Mr. Rae: If the Treasurer thinks it is somehow responsible to leave three quarters of a million people in this province without any prospect of employment this year, that is a very bizarre and, I would say, even perverse definition of responsibility in Ontario. If that is what it takes to be responsible and respectable, then I am proud to be a member of my party and not a member of that complacent crowd over there.

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

Mr. Rae: I would simply like to ask the Treasurer, since he has not really responded to this question, given the fact that private investment is down according to his own figures and according to his own arguments, how can he justify a continued cut in capital investment by the public sector when there are people out there waiting to do some work and when there are jobs that so clearly need to be done in this province?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I watched my friend on TV on the night of the budget, repeating a lot of things I did not think were in it—I suppose they may be; I will have to look through it—talking about cuts here and cuts there. A \$247-million increase in the capital spending program in addition to that which is normal, in my opinion is not a cut.

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, the reality is that the Treasurer's programs have about a five per cent increase, which is less than inflation. In real terms, that is a cut.

Mr. Nixon: The Minister of Industry and Trade (Mr. Walker) got a cut.

Mr. Peterson: That is a cut.

The reality is, and we have to get back to the essential point, the minister is forecasting higher unemployment next year than this year. That means the government and the Treasurer have decided that is not a priority. Why did he make that decision, that he is not prepared to actively attack the unemployment situation?

Hon. F. S. Miller: My colleague assumes I did not, Mr. Speaker. I am simply telling it the way it is. The member does not want to hear the facts. I would like to wipe it off the slate. I challenge him to tell me what he would do to get rid of 500,000 unemployed tomorrow morning.

Mr. Rae: If the Treasurer has his budget, he can turn to page 50 where he will see, "Table 7, Recent Trends in Ontario's Capital Investment. Social investments, 1982-83, \$469 million; estimated 1983-84, \$458 million." That is a cut. That is less; \$458 million is less than \$469 million. "Economic investments, \$1,660 million in 1982-83; \$1,653 million in 1983-84." That is a cut. That is \$7 million less.

How can he justify investing less in the social services and less in the economic infrastructure of this province at a time when there are 750,000 people out of work and at a time when on his own admission the consumer recovery is not there and the private sector is not doing the spending on its own?

Hon. F. S. Miller: The member is talking about two different kinds of investment. I was talking about investment by the productive side of society. It is to this figure that I understand the \$247 million was added. If the member would look at the bottom, \$2,314 million is greater than \$2,282 million.

Mr. Rae: If we add the financial assets, the land and miscellaneous, we come up with a figure which is still less than real inflation in Ontario—

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

Mr. Rae: —but if we look at the economic and social infrastructure, we have a cut. No matter how the Treasurer cuts it, he still has a cut and he cannot turn that around.

FUNDING FOR POLLUTION CONTROL

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the

Treasurer a question with respect to the environment in particular. If he would turn again to the budget—and no matter how he cuts it, he can try to play with the figures all he likes but the figures stand on their own—with respect to the Ministry of the Environment, given there is, admittedly, a very real crisis with respect to pollution in the Niagara River, given that acid rain remains the greatest environmental problem facing the province and much of North America, and given the real problem of cleanup of many of our landfill sites, how can the Treasurer, speaking on behalf of the people of Ontario, justify a \$32-million cut in expenditures by the Ministry of the Environment?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I am sure when the ministry's estimates are up, the member will be able to go through them line by line to see where those differences occur. It happens that the ministry has been very actively involved in some major projects around the province. I would like the minister himself to tell the member what his overall investment is as opposed to the previous year. I think he can do that more adequately.

Mr. Rae: With great respect, the Treasurer is responsible for the economic policy of this government. With great respect, he is not going to be able to fob it off on some minister whom he claims is going to give us the answers. Those of us who try to get some answers out of the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Norton) know how difficult that is. I think we are entitled to ask the Treasurer about the figures contained here.

Let us look at the economic investment side: "Environment, 1982-83, \$318 million; 1983-84, \$280 million." Given the things waiting to be done in this province with respect to acid rain, the cleanup of the Niagara River, maintaining a safe water system, the cleanup of the dump sites and an end to industrial pollution, how can he possibly justify the kinds of the cutbacks he is carrying out, given that we still have 750,000 people unemployed?

Hon. F. S. Miller: That is the very kind of question one does ask in estimates rather than to the minister responsible for economic development. But let me point out, using the member's own figures, with \$38 million less on the capital side, if I added that back on the general operating costs, which include many of the things he is talking about, the figure would be higher. So I suggest the member wait for the

explanation by the minister who has the details of that.

2:30 p.m.

Mr. Elston: Mr. Speaker, during the budget speech the Treasurer mentioned that a further \$300 million was to be trimmed from his budget. Can he guarantee those of us who are very sensitive about environmental problems in Ontario that he will not be asking the Minister of the Environment to cut more money from his programs at a time when we know the Ontario Waste Management Corp. requires extra funds to deal with its project and there are serious problems with the water tower systems of many small municipalities which the Ministry of the Environment must repair? Can the Treasurer guarantee that the Minister of the Environment will not have to forgo money for those very necessary and emergency programs with respect to the environment in Ontario?

Hon. F. S. Miller: With great respect, Mr. Speaker, it is intriguing to me that this is the day the honourable member asks me to spend more, but most of his party colleagues' speeches will be aimed at the government's alleged waste of money. That is exactly what I hear all around the province. When those fellows return to their own ridings, they do not say, "We asked them to spend more," but, "Why did they spend so much? Why did they run such a poor government?"

I am sure my colleague the Minister of the Environment can and will answer those questions. The member knows he will have his crack at him, because he does it every year.

Mr. Elston: I asked you about the \$300 million.

Hon. F. S. Miller: The member cannot suck and blow at the same time. Right now, that is what he is doing; he is talking in class.

Mr. Charlton: Mr. Speaker, considering our rate of unemployment and the need for capital expenditure in the area of the environment, how can the Treasurer possibly justify cuts in the capital expenditure area? How does he think that will be viewed, both by the public in Ontario and by our American neighbours, with whom we are trying to negotiate an increase in capital expenditure in terms of pollution abatement?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I am glad the honourable member talks about our American neighbours. Compared to any neighbouring state, our track record in cleaning up the environment is absolutely superb.

PUBLIC DEBT

Mr. T. P. Reid: Mr. Speaker, the Treasurer wants to talk about the debt; so perhaps we can. I am sure he is aware that the public debt has increased from \$17.6 billion in the 1981-82 fiscal year to \$22.5 billion in the 1982-83 fiscal year, an increase of 27.6 per cent in two years. He is aware that we owe \$2,555 for every man, woman and child in this province.

What we are talking about here are the Treasurer's priorities. Can he tell us how he can justify this increase in debt, which is not providing jobs for the people of Ontario? In fact, the Treasurer's own figures indicate unemployment will increase at the same time the public debt is going up. Obviously we are not seeing any results from that increased public debt.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, is that not nice? I hope I can tie this question in with the comment of the honourable member's leader that I was not spending enough. The member is telling me I have too big a debt and his leader is saying I should not raise taxes. How do I put those two questions together? Why did I raise taxes? Why did I let the debt go up? Seriously, what would the members over there do?

The last time there was a Liberal government in this province—thank God it is 40 years ago; it will be another 40 until there is another one, and I hope the New Democrats do not get in in between—we were left with four years' revenue-debt ratio. They left us with four years of debt compared to revenue. We have one year. We have improved it by one quarter.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Obviously the Treasurer did not listen carefully to the question. We are talking about priorities. We are not complaining about the size of the deficit if it is providing jobs for the people of Ontario. We are complaining that the deficit is for Suncor, advertising, Minaki Lodge and all that stuff. That is what we are complaining about.

The government's fiscal mismanagement over the past 10 years of the Premier's (Mr. Davis) reign means the Treasurer can increase the deficit to deal with the unemployment problems we have in this province right now.

No doubt Mr. Kaufman was the one who was crying on the phone about the Treasurer's present difficulties. Can the Treasurer tell us what is the advice from his financial experts as to how high or far the provincial deficit can go without endangering our credit rating, about which the Treasurer is so concerned?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I am so glad the member mentioned Minaki because I understand his brother got elected on Minaki.

Interjections.

Hon. F. S. Miller: What is sauce for the goose ought to be—

Mr. T. P. Reid: Oh no he didn't.

Hon. F. S. Miller: He did not, eh? I think he supported Minaki; did he not?

Hon. Mr. McCague: Oh, yes, he did.

Hon. Mr. Baetz: He is a big hero around there.

Hon. F. S. Miller: He is a big hero up there and we are glad to get the comments back.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Does the member ever talk to his brother?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I wish the member would turn to page 46 of the budget. If he looks at the little bar chart he will see that in terms of deficit per person, Ontario is the lowest in Canada. He does not like that figure, does he?

Mr. Martel: Where is your unemployment rate?

Hon. F. S. Miller: That is Alberta. It is the highest in Canada. Whether the member likes it or not, Ontario's economy is recovering faster than any other province's in Canada. A lot of them are pretty envious of us right now.

Mr. Cooke: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Treasurer about this year's deficit. I would like to ask him why he decided to use an approach which I believe really lacks honesty. He presents the deficit at \$2.6 billion when it is really \$3 billion because there are \$300 million worth of cuts in expenditures still to come in Ontario. Why did he not present an honest budget that either had those cuts already in the estimates or a budget that presented the \$3-billion deficit that really exists now?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, last year when we gave our revenue and our expenditure estimates, each was within 0.7 per cent of being accurate. That was the best track record in Canada. We found over \$700 million of adjustments in the year and the member wonders if I cannot find \$300 million with the help of this highly qualified team behind me.

Mr. Cooke: The point is the Treasurer and the Minister of Health (Mr. Grossman) go out one day and say they are going to give big grants to the hospitals and they get all sorts of good

publicity and the next day they cut those grants back. It lacks honesty.

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

ONTARIO PROPERTY TAX CREDIT

Mr. Cooke: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Treasurer to explain what he meant by the statement on page 20 of his budget. In talking about program review he says, "In this regard I have questioned the usefulness of continuing the Ontario property tax credit now that comprehensive property tax reform has been postponed indefinitely."

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to. The member asked me all last week for an open approach to tax reform. I am asking, as I have in three previous budgets, a basic question about the wisdom of a particular program.

I will have a full year of input, I hope, between now and the time I have to respond. Next year I, as Treasurer, will be quite glad to decide whether or not we need that property tax reform after I have heard the reaction of the municipalities and the people of this province.

Mr. Cooke: I would like to quote from the 1972 budget presented by Mr. McKeough, where he introduced the property tax credit. "Our property tax credit plan has one primary objective: to produce a fairer and more progressive distribution of the property tax burden borne by individuals and families in Ontario."

Without property tax reform in this province, how can the Treasurer even flag the possibility of eliminating the property tax credit which to some small degree eliminates some of the regressiveness of that property tax?

Hon. F. S. Miller: To ask about the appropriateness of a program is not automatically to eliminate that program. We asked about the appropriateness of personal income tax and did not change it. We asked about the appropriateness of the Ontario health insurance plan and did not change it. We are asking about the appropriateness of this tax and we want to see what people think.

Unlike the member's group, we listen before we act.

2:40 p.m.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Mr. Speaker, obviously this is again going to hit those who can least afford it in our society. Could I recall to the Treasurer the statement: "Our property tax credit plan has one primary objective: to produce a fairer and more progressive distribution of the property tax burden borne by individuals and families in

Ontario. It will replace the basic shelter grants that have been in effect since 1968 and deliver relief from the regressive property tax according to individual needs."

Is the Treasurer repudiating that philosophy, which seemed to everyone who was in the House at the time to be a reasonable and fair one?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Of course not, Mr. Speaker, but I think the points made were, one, it was expected there would be a comprehensive property tax reform; that has not occurred. Second, it also appeared to be a shift towards the municipal taxpayer of the tax burden. In the last four or five years that has been reversed. We have to look at the total share of taxes, of income paid at the property tax level, to determine if it is fair.

We have been lowering that share through very progressive grants from Ontario.

ASSISTANCE TO FARMERS

Mr. Riddell: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture and Food. I am sure the minister was as disappointed as I was in the Treasurer's obvious lack of commitment to the agricultural industry, with the exception of a regurgitated promise to start a credit program for beginning farmers.

In view of the fact that farmers who are in the most serious financial difficulty are the beginning farmers, those who have entered the industry in the last few years, can the minister tell us whether the reannounced beginning farmers program will be made retroactive to include these recent entrants into the agricultural industry? How does the minister intend to help those farmers? Will eligible loans for subsidy under the program include those secured through banks, trust companies and supply companies, as well as the Farm Credit Corp.?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, contrary to the point of view of the honourable member—which is not surprising; I would not expect anything positive from him—my colleague the Treasurer has been extremely co-operative and extremely supportive of agriculture at this time. In a couple of weeks' time when we get down to looking at the estimates of the ministry, one need only look at 1982, when the Treasurer provided significant assistance to agriculture, whether through assistance to the Crop Insurance Commission of Ontario, or through the farmstead improvement program or in any number of ways.

The pledge that is evidenced in the budget

address of 48 hours ago is very significant in terms of the numbers of young farmers we anticipate will be assisted by it. I am sure it bothers the member that the program commitment has been so well received by members of the farm community. They appreciate how significant it is. I expect to announce the details of the program in the next three or four weeks.

Mr. Riddell: In view of the fact there was no announcement in the budget for any financial assistance for the Ontario Veterinary College which, as the minister well knows, is in desperate need of funds and which has recently had its accreditation reduced for the first time since its beginning in 1922; in view of the fact that the quality and training provided by the college has a direct impact on the viability and competitiveness of the agricultural industry; and in view of the fact that the Quebec budget, also given on Tuesday last, promised \$402.2 million to the farmers in that province as opposed to \$295 million in the Ontario budget, how can our farmers hope to remain competitive with this lack of commitment?

Will the minister at least assure us that increased funding for the veterinary college will be announced, as part of the \$8.4 million allocation for agriculture, under the new capital acceleration program?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I am not sure that is entirely supplementary to the first question, but I am happy to answer it. I am also happy to answer it in some detail, so I will apologize now for what may be—

Mr. Speaker: Briefly, please.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: All right. I would take the member back to the last accreditation report of the Ontario Veterinary College. At that time they identified essentially two kinds of problems: one being the capital needs of the college the other being the operating needs with respect to clinical services. Just over a year ago, I went to the University of Guelph and announced that my colleagues had given me the authority to commit an additional \$1.8 million per year to be devoted to clinical services, particularly for the externship program. That \$1.8 million was the amount, to the penny, that Guelph itself had calculated was required to address the clinical service problems brought out in the last accreditation review.

At that time, the president of the university and others said, "Yes, but there is this capital problem we have." Fortunately, I knew at the time that in the spring of 1982 the University of

Guelph had placed the Ontario Veterinary College as number seven on its list of capital priorities. I said to them quite frankly: "If it is that serious, why is it not number one? It cannot be that serious or it would be."

Since then I have met with the administration of the university several times. As a result of those meetings it is now number one on the list. Since then, I have also met on several occasions with my colleague in Ottawa, Mr. Whelan, urging him to get a commitment from his colleagues in the federal government to do their part, as in the past, in addressing the capital needs of the OVC.

I do have a commitment from my colleagues the Minister of Colleges and Universities (Miss Stephenson), the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) and the Chairman of Management Board (Mr. McCague) that Ontario is prepared to put up its 50 per cent of the cost of beginning to address the capital needs of the Ontario Veterinary College and to do it this year. We will be approaching the federal government to get its commitment to do likewise and to start this year to plan for that.

Mr. Swart: Mr. Speaker, recognizing that regardless of how the minister cuts it there is going to be a substantial reduction in Ontario's agricultural budget this year—the minister shakes his head, but of course there is—will he assure this House that this beginning farmers program of \$9 million this year and the additional moneys next year will not come out of any regular farm program or any assistance program, but will be new money going into that program?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, the money committed by my colleague the Treasurer in the estimates of the Ministry of Agriculture and Food for the beginning farmers assistance program is new money. I want to say to my friend we can get into it in estimates again starting June 1. We went through a similar exercise last fall. In fact, the spending by the ministry, the base estimates of the ministry, are higher this year than they were last year.

I remind the member we put significant amounts of money into crop insurance in 1982, especially for the tobacco growers of this province, which had not been budgeted for and which put us well beyond the printed estimates of the ministry.

I anticipate that, Lord forbid, if we were to face a similar tragedy of nature in 1983, the support would again be there from my colleagues in the cabinet, as it has been in the past.

FUNDING FOR NORTHERN ONTARIO

Mr. Foulds: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Treasurer. Is he fully aware of these three factors in his budget as they affect northern Ontario:

1. The Ministry of Northern Affairs expenditures are apparently slashed by \$22 million, if table C3 on page 59 is correct.

2. The natural resources centre he announced with such pride is to be located right across the street at the University of Toronto when the vast majority of our natural resources are in northern Ontario. That centre is not to be located at Sudbury or Thunder Bay.

3. There were absolutely no specific details in funding to back up the throne speech promise on page 8 which was, "Specifically, we can expect assistance to single-industry communities in northern Ontario."

Can the Treasurer tell us whether this neglect of the north was deliberate or simple political insensitivity and stupidity?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I want to say one thing. As long as my colleague the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Bernier) is in his present position, which will be a long time, the member will never need to worry about political insensitivity to northern Ontario. Would I had the same ability when it comes to getting dollars out of the government of Ontario.

The member should look at the two special projects in last year's budget. He should recognize we put a lot of money into Minaki and into the Detour Lake road. They were two specific projects.

The member should also understand that he is trying to make it look as though a brand new centre is being created where nothing exists. At the University of Toronto they are amalgamating a number of parts of campus activities that have been spread all over the place in old buildings into one convenient location, in modernized buildings, not necessarily new buildings.

I hope the Minister of Colleges and Universities (Miss Stephenson) can discuss that at greater length, but it in no way takes away from the quality of the courses at Lakehead or at Sudbury, and the member knows that.

2:50 p.m.

Mr. Foulds: Is the minister telling me there are no special projects for northern Ontario in this year's budget to replace Minaki? Is he telling me the so-called natural resources centre is nothing new, that it is simply an amalgamation of old stuff that is already located at the

University of Toronto? Finally, will he answer my question about the specific promise for help for single-industry towns in the throne speech, which was not delivered in the budget?

Hon. F. S. Miller: How many questions can I answer, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: One.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I find it astounding to have the member for Port Arthur telling me I should replace the money spent on Minaki after listening to him complain about it for so long.

Mr. Van Horne: Mr. Speaker, the government through the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Timbrell) indicated some time earlier this year that there would be new initiatives for the agricultural industry in northern Ontario. We cannot find evidence of that in the budget. Would the Treasurer care to comment on that?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, the member knows it is quite proper to ask the specific minister about that. I do not see that as a supplementary.

TELEVISION IN LEGISLATURE

Mr. Bradley: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs in his capacity as government House leader on the televising of the proceedings of this House. Members of the House will know that on Tuesday we could not move around this building for television cameras. There were two what looked like permanent cameras here and here. There were a large number of cameras along the gallery, out in the hallway, all around this House. Those cameras are always here, Mr. Speaker, as you know, for the two premier events the government brings forward, the throne speech and the budget speech. There is great coverage of that, and nothing now, of course.

I am aware this is a subject of discussion and negotiation, and my question to the minister is this. In the interests of balance, fairness and accessibility to the proceedings of this House for the people of this province, will he give an undertaking as government House leader, and can he tell us the views of the Premier (Mr. Davis), his leader, on the televising of all the proceedings of this House at the earliest opportunity?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, if my friend will talk to his colleague to the left he will understand, as I am sure the Speaker will also be able to tell him, that this matter is being discussed by

the Board of Internal Economy next Monday. All views will be presented then. We will have a chance to have a full discussion about the use of television, electronic Hansard, whatever one wants to call it, in this House.

I also want to say that the camera will be here. There was a guarantee the camera would be here. We are so fair that we have given up having the camera over there for the presentations of the members opposite. There will just be a camera over here. It will be appearing soon.

Since we were all sitting here and did not have an opportunity to view the presentation, I might say there was no live television coverage of the Treasurer's budget the other day, and that bothers me. The cameras were in here, but it was not what went on in this House that went out over television.

Mr. Bradley: I should note in my supplementary that the House leader of the Ontario Liberal Party indicated that is exactly the answer the government House leader would give me. He was anticipating that.

I know there are negotiations going on. I know the Board of Internal Economy is discussing this matter. What I am asking the government House leader and his Premier is whether they are prepared to say they will endorse the full proceedings of this House being televised in this meeting. Are they prepared to endorse that? Are they prepared to give it their okay? If they do, it is guaranteed to go through and at long last the people of this province will have access to the other legislative chamber that exists in Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I do not play cards very much, but when I do get into a game I do not turn over my cards and show them until I really get into the game.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Martel: What did you feed the seals today?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Martel: I don't know what you fed the seals, but they are working well.

Mr. Speaker, given that we could utilize TVOntario to carry question period, since we have some responsibility in this area, and seeing that the select committee recommended as early as 1976 proper television coverage for the zoo, can we have some assurance that, as part of the package that is being contemplated, television so that question period, the budget and the

throne speech will be carried live to the people of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Wells: First of all, let us be very clear about this. Television is in this House. I do not know what all that is up there in the gallery. Television is in this House, and with the agreement of the Speaker at any time those cameras can appear, these lights can come on and any proceeding of this House can be televised. So the question is not whether we should have television here or not; it is the manner and form of the television.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Wells: We have agreed to discuss this at a meeting that I think is next Monday, and I think it is really very premature to discuss anybody's views on this until we get in and have a discussion at your committee, Mr. Speaker.

INCOME TAX SURCHARGE

Mr. R. F. Johnston: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Treasurer, and it applies to his social services maintenance tax or surtax.

The Treasurer will know that the surtax we talked about was on taxable incomes of over \$40,000; that is where it would start. How does he explain this tax as being at all fair and exempting the poor when somebody who earns \$3.70 an hour will have to pay this tax and when a family that has an income of \$12,500 a year will have to pay this tax? How can he possibly accept the notion that somebody who is getting the average amount of unemployment insurance payments in this province of \$155.93 a week will have to pay this tax? Is this not a regressive tax?

Hon. F. S. Miller: No, it is not, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. R. F. Johnston: I find it hard to believe that the Treasurer would answer in such a cavalier fashion.

Will the Treasurer please comment on this strange anomaly? Even under his elusive premium assistance plan, which the member for Bellwoods (Mr. McClellan) raises a lot of the time around here, one can be eligible to receive premium assistance if the taxable family income is less than \$3,500 a year, yet his surtax will apply to people who have a taxable income of \$2,178 a year. How is it that somebody can be too poor to pay his Ontario health insurance plan premiums but not too poor to pay the Treasurer's surtax?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Not all taxes take over at the same level. I am sure the member knows that. For example, sales tax, which he considers progressive most days of the week, has no such

exemption, but we do have our credit on the income tax form. I simply say that we have a very wide range of carefully balanced taxes in this province producing revenue in fair and proportioned ways.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, does the minister not feel that even naming a tax a social services maintenance tax adds to the stigma of those unfortunate people who are unemployed and on welfare assistance right now? Would it not have been more appropriate to call any surtax the Minaki Lodge fiasco tax, the land banking vision tax or the Suncor interest maintenance payments tax?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I do not really think the honourable member was expecting a serious answer.

3 p.m.

ARENA FUNDING

Mr. Van Horne: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Industry and Trade.

Press reports in the past five months reflect a determination on his behalf to prevent the city of London from getting a grant to help it build a new arena in the south end of the city. Will he explain why he is trying to use his influence as a cabinet minister to interfere with the affairs of the city of London?

Hon. Mr. Walker: First of all, Mr. Speaker, that is a question that does not pertain directly to the Ministry of Industry and Trade. However, I am prepared to answer it if you desire that I answer something beyond my own particular field.

Mr. Speaker: Briefly.

Hon. Mr. Walker: The short of it is that I have the right as the local MPP to express an opinion about anything that may occur in the city of London involving provincial funding. This particular matter involves provincial funding.

Mr. Van Horne: I thank the Speaker for ruling as he did, because in one of the press reports I have in front of me the minister is making reference to public money putting a business out of business and he was speaking in reference to his position as the minister.

The minister and the member for Middlesex (Mr. Eaton) are on record as trying to get the city to buy Hockeyland, a facility that is out in the township and is owned by a Mr. Skinner. I wonder whether this is the same Mr. Skinner who gave the minister a significant amount of money in his election campaign; if this is so, is this not a conflict of interest?

Hon. Mr. Walker: It certainly is, and I think it is the same man who also gave some money to some of the other candidates in the London area. The honourable member might like to check that out.

ASSISTANCE TO FARMERS

Mr. Swart: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Treasurer. It does not matter what kind of excuses are given; the fact is that the amount he has in his budget for agriculture in constant dollars is 19 per cent lower than it was last year.

We know that the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Timbrell) has given the excuse that there was an extraordinary expenditure for insurance to tobacco growers last year. If that is the reason, how does the Treasurer explain that the amount he has in his budget for agriculture this year is 13 per cent lower in constant dollars than it was two years ago when that payment was not paid to the tobacco farmers?

With the amount of mortgage and loan payments in default by farmers being 50 per cent higher in March of this year than it was a year ago, the impending disaster in the farm community is every bit as great as it was last year, although it may be more spread out and not just involving the tobacco farmers. How does he justify that tremendous decrease in the amount for agriculture?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, there is probably a difference between the actual expenditures and the printed estimates, and I think one should always look at the printed estimates before the year began. The honourable member will realize that in each of the last two and possibly three years there have been fairly heavy extraordinary, one-time-only payments made in Agriculture and Food.

I have no idea whether there will be some calamity this year requiring similar extraordinary payments. We have shown the flexibility to meet them in the year when they were needed.

Mr. Swart: Does the minister not feel the fact that farmers are in default in their payments in an amount 50 per cent higher than last year is already a calamity and an indication of an impending disaster?

Is he unaware of what Ralph Barrie, the president of the Ontario Federation of Agriculture, said about his program? Mr. Barrie said he criticized the Treasurer for failing to address the credit needs of Ontario's 40,000 to 50,000 established farmers. "This program doesn't do a bloody thing for those people," he said. Can the minister deny that?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I have great respect for Mr. Barrie. I would like to have a chat with him before I react to the member's quote out of context.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, is it not a fact that farmers in Quebec get assistance to the tune of \$9,000 a year while the Treasurer assists farmers in Ontario in the order of \$3,000 a year? How can he expect farmers from eastern Ontario to compete with their counterparts in that neighbouring province when from the start there is a \$6,000 difference in the assistance they will get from government?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, the farmer in Quebec pays a 40 per cent tax on his gasoline too. The farmer in Quebec, if he makes any income, pays a much higher income tax. The farmer in Quebec is faced with a government that has not run its funds too well. The farmer in Quebec receives, through the federal government, equalization payments of almost \$3 billion a year, mostly from Ontario.

NOTICE OF DISSATISFACTION

Mr. R. F. Johnston: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: Pursuant to standing order 28(a), I wish to advise you of my dissatisfaction with the response of the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) to my question on the social services maintenance tax.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you.

[Later]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Cousens): Pursuant to standing order 28, the member for Scarborough West has given notice of his dissatisfaction with the answer to his question given by the Treasurer and Minister of Economics concerning the social services maintenance tax. This matter will be debated at 10:30 p.m.

MOTIONS

ESTIMATES

Hon. Mr. Wells moved that notwithstanding any previous order of the House, the estimates as they are presented to the House be referred to the standing committees as indicated in the estimates statement tabled earlier today.

Motion agreed to.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Hon. Mr. Wells moved that the standing committee on resources development be author-

ized to sit the afternoon of Wednesday, June 1, 1983.

Motion agreed to.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

SMITH BROS. & SONS LIMITED ACT

Mr. Kells moved, seconded by Mr. Kolyn, first reading of Bill Pr24, An Act to revive Smith Bros. & Sons Builders Limited.

Motion agreed to.

ONTARIO LOAN ACT, 1983

Hon. F. S. Miller moved, seconded by Hon. Mr. Wells, first reading of Bill 34, An Act to authorize the Raising of Money on the Credit of the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

Motion agreed to.

TOBACCO TAX AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Ashe moved, seconded by Hon. Mr. Bernier, first reading of Bill 35, An Act to amend the Tobacco Tax Act.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: Mr. Speaker, this bill provides for the amendments arising out of the Treasurer's budget of May 10, 1983, as well as for some administrative amendments.

The bill increases the rate of tax on cigarettes and cut tobacco from 40 to 45 per cent of their retail prices. This change, which is effective May 11, 1983, brings the applicable tax to 2.3 cents per cigarette and to 1.4 per cent per gram or part of a gram of cut tobacco and all other tobacco products, except cigars. The tax rate on cigars remains unchanged at 45 per cent.

3:10 p.m.

SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CORPORATIONS AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Ashe moved, seconded by Hon. Mr. Bernier, first reading of Bill 36, An Act to amend the Small Business Development Corporations Act.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: Mr. Speaker, this bill implements amendments arising out of the Treasurer's budget of May 10, 1983, as well as some administrative amendments.

The bill limits the maximum investment in any one project by one or more small business development corporations to \$5 million. The eligibility requirements for an investment by a small business development corporation have also been amended. The administrative amend-

ments contained in the bill enact certain policies required in the effective administration of the act.

RETAIL SALES TAX AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Ashe moved, seconded by Hon. Mr. Bernier, first reading of Bill 37, An Act to amend the Retail Sales Tax Act.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: Mr. Speaker, this bill contains the changes to the Retail Sales Tax Act announced in the 1983 budget as well as some administrative amendments.

The bill provides for a temporary exemption for new residential furniture and major household appliances. It broadens the exemption for machinery and equipment purchased by manufacturers and producers and for certain transportation vehicles and equipment. In addition, the bill eliminates the exemption for tobacco products. The tax on beverage alcohol sold at retail outlets will increase from 10 per cent to 12 per cent, effective May 24, 1983.

Other budgetary changes include the expansion of exemptions concerning alternative-fueled vehicles, admissions to places of amusement, certain gold coins and educational publications. The majority of the proposed administrative amendments are aimed to update and revise a number of penalty provisions, which should help in deterring noncompliance and the ensuing loss of provincial tax revenues.

CORPORATIONS TAX AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Ashe moved, seconded by Hon. Mr. Bernier, first reading of Bill 38, An Act to amend the Corporations Tax Act.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: Mr. Speaker, the bill contains amendments arising out of the Treasurer's budget of May 10, 1983, as well as some administrative amendments.

The budgetary measures being implemented by this bill include the increase in the income tax rate by one percentage point, the extension of income tax exemptions for small businesses by one year and the temporary capital tax relief for "loss" corporations.

INFLATION RESTRAINT AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Peterson moved, seconded by Mr. Nixon, first reading of Bill 39, An Act to amend the Inflation Restraint Act.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, these are amendments to Bill 179, which passed in the last session. They would make the bill more equitable and fair for everyone concerned.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, before calling the orders of the day, I might ask the table to keep the time allotments for the contributions this afternoon. It has been agreed to split the time remaining from now until six o'clock between the two speakers.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

BUDGET DEBATE

(continued)

Resuming the adjourned debate on the motion that this House approves in general the budgetary policy of the government.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I rise to present the official opposition's views on the 1983 budget of the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller). We intend to be very positive in our remarks and in putting forward our views on what should have been in the Treasurer's budget.

We in this party agree with some of the budgetary measures proposed by the Treasurer, particularly the extension of the tax holiday for small businesses and those matters that parallel the federal initiatives in terms of the carryback and carry-forward losses and profits relating to corporations. We agree with those measures fully.

Last year's budget was a budget of sins of commission, particularly the extension of the retail sales tax. This budget can be largely criticized as a budget in which the sins are of omission. That is primarily what I want to talk about.

In this party we are concerned about the fact that the Treasurer is predicting an unemployment rate of more than 11 per cent for the next year. That concerns us very deeply, especially when we put that in conjunction with the highest deficit and highest budget we have ever had in this province. Yet we do not see the jobs being created with those tax dollars that are being spent.

More than that, our concern is that the economic future of Ontario is not dealt with in this document at all. We were told by both the Premier (Mr. Davis) and the Treasurer that this was the economic statement of the year as far as charting Ontario's course went. If this is the budget and the economic document that is going to give some hope to the people of the province, some vision of the future, it is not just

sadly lacking, but completely lacking. The budget should have told us where this province wants to be in five, 10 and 20 years. This budget has refused to face the future squarely.

A Liberal government would have seized this opportunity to position ourselves for the future, for the rest of the 1980s. Strategies concerning productivity, research and development, human resource management and the careful husbanding of our natural resources are the cornerstones of the Ontario Liberal policy. Government has a role to play in ensuring orderly change in society. Uncertainty about the future destroys the individual's ability to make long-range plans.

As I mentioned, the government has made some constructive changes in this budget, but these good points are lost in a myriad of ad hoc and piecemeal changes. Can the government tell us today what the long-term strategy is for this province? Can we claim that this government's stewardship, typified by this document, is leaving the proper legacy to our children? Unfortunately, the government has stopped running in place and has started only to walk in place.

3:20 p.m.

I want to deal with only about four or five items. I particularly want to talk about productivity in the context of charting a course for Ontario for the 1980s.

Productivity has been defined in a number of ways, usually as the output per man-hour, mostly in terms of labour input and output. But productivity is not a problem of laziness of our work force. Productivity is not simply high technology, as the Treasurer would have us believe. Productivity is efficiency; it is what our performance is.

I have tried to engage the Treasurer both in terms of last year's budget and in terms of his estimates in dealing with productivity and the Ontario economy. I suppose I can take some small measure of consolation from the fact that he mentioned the word once in this budget, but that is all.

Productivity is efficiency and productivity is competitiveness. How we can have a budget document, the main economic blueprint for Ontario, and not deal with these crucial matters is beyond me, especially when we all know Ontario and Canada have one of the worst demonstrations of productivity of any western democracy. We should have been discussing this. The Treasurer should have recommended that there be a discussion paper on this issue more than anything else.

What should be done in terms of productivity? There probably should be some system of tax incentives for those who can improve productivity, there should be an expanded definition of research and development and we should be paralleling some of the incentives at the federal level.

With the shifting industrial structure, it is imperative for Canada and Ontario to establish and maintain a comparative advantage in as many sectors as possible, not only in secondary industry but also in primary industry. A comparative advantage does not simply happen by itself. Planning and hard work develop one's strengths and enable one to capitalize on potential opportunities. That is what the budget does not do. We have no plan to emphasize our strengths and we will not be able to capitalize on our opportunities.

Productivity and research and development are crucial elements in an overall strategy vision for Ontario in the 1980s. Let us take advantage of what we have and what we can have. A misconception exists that Ontario's poor productivity performance is due to employee laziness. For instance, people might say Canadians are not working as hard as the Japanese or the West Germans. That is simply not the case.

Productivity is not simply high technology. Another misconception that is reinforced by the Treasurer is that productivity is simply incorporating high technology into the production process, i.e., computer-aided design/computer-aided manufacturing robotics. This is true in many respects, but it misses huge potential in other areas.

Productivity is efficiency. Productivity is simply a measure of efficiency, how innovatively industry uses each element that goes into producing a product or service. Productivity is not working harder, but smarter.

From 1960 to 1980, Canada had a productivity growth of 2.4 per cent a year on average. This is clearly below the average of 3.9 per cent for the 16 other member countries of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development. Only the United Kingdom experienced a slower rate of growth, approximately 2.3 per cent. This 2.4 per cent figure has dropped to a point where we are losing ground in productivity.

The reasons for our poor efficiency are numerous. The Economic Council of Canada claims the present recession accounts for only half the productivity decline. The other half comes from structural problems and the orientation of management, labour and government.

This budget does nothing at all to address these issues.

Management and labour, and obviously this government, do not look to comparative advantage and productivity as a fight for survival. Management was content to concentrate on mergers and acquisitions, which take up scarce capital but which produce no real economic growth. Labour has been seen as totally disregarding competitive problems. As well, management does not trust labour, labour does not trust management and neither trusts government.

Efficient co-ordination of production components cannot take place in an environment such as this. With all our major trading partners, such as the United States and the European Economic Community, it is interesting to see the co-operation among government, labour and management in this area and to see the kind of involvement government has.

They say the United States is based mainly on myth, and one of the myths is the free enterprise system of which the Treasurer is so enamoured. For someone presumably of his experience and knowledge, he is awfully blind when it comes to seeing the tremendous amount of assistance given to industry by governments at all levels in the United States.

The role of government should be to facilitate a structure and environment in which productivity will be improved. The budget is said, by the Treasurer among others, to be a psychological document, yet no mention is made of improving management's or labour's orientation to productivity improvements. No attention is focused on these pressing problems.

We in this province could embark upon a productivity centre which could be developed here. The centre would provide an emphasis and focus on productivity and its benefits, providing a framework for co-ordinating production components. Specifically, this would involve collecting and performing research on productivity and providing practical application of the theories. Areas of emphasis could be on the development of a co-operative environment, partially through employee participation, and on providing courses on modern management techniques and plant management, distribution, material and inventory control, and industrial engineering.

Unlike Board of Industrial Leadership and Development technology centres, productivity centres would emphasize a whole production process and not simply automation through robotics, CAD/CAM and microelectronics.

Ontario is far behind in developing a productivity emphasis. The Japanese productivity centre was started in 1953, the West German in 1952 and the US centre in 1977. It is interesting that the Premier himself, I understand, gave some thought to this in 1975, but for some reason unknown to me he killed the idea at the outset.

Of the funding for the centre in Japan, 20 per cent is provided by the government, while for the West German centre, 60 per cent funding is provided by the government, and the one in the US is privately funded. Perhaps there is a role of funding, but it seems to me, with the resources available to labour, management and government, those items could be worked out.

If we define productivity as high-tech production, we lose the benefits in the important resource-based industries. Increased harmony among labour, management and government, and the application of modern management and distribution techniques will surely help the mining and forestry section.

Ronald Anderson wrote a column in the *Globe and Mail* of December 22, 1982, entitled "Serious Consequences Loom If Productivity Issue Ignored." I quote from that article:

"Productivity improvement, however, must be a long-term, rather than a short-term, objective. It should be regarded not as a threat, but as protection for existing jobs. Without an improvement in productivity, as the United States recognizes, many jobs will be destroyed by an inability to compete in the market."

One of the benefits of doing this, of course, will be to deal with that one facet of automation and the effect it will have on our work force, and to bring labour into the whole discussion in terms of how to adjust. We are kidding ourselves and the labour people as well, because to compete internationally we are going to have to be as competitive as, or more competitive than, our trading partners in the world.

3:30 p.m.

Andrew Kniewasser, president of the Investment Dealers' Association of Canada, stated at an Ontario Chamber of Commerce meeting on April 14, 1983: "In our situation, and with our export reliance, increased productivity is the only way to achieve substantial increases in employment. It is the only way to ensure secure employment in Canada."

Again, planning for the future, research and development is a crucial element in an overall strategy for Ontario in the 1980s. For Ontario to develop comparative advantage, we must have a competitive edge. Research and development

is like productivity in that it can make us competitive, but we must develop this capacity.

We know that Canada spends less than one per cent of its gross national product on R and D, compared with 2.5 per cent in the United States and 2.1 per cent in West Germany. We must have not only a higher quantity of research and development but also R and D in a quality form, a form that enables development of secondary processing of our natural resources.

The Treasurer, in his Tory ideology of the 19th century, gives us a paper in which he comes to the conclusion that there is nothing Ontario should be doing. But if we do not increase our R and D in this province, one of the significant and sad losses to Ontario is going to be those people, our human resource, with the education they have obtained at great expense to the taxpayers of this province. They will go somewhere else if the opportunities for them to exercise their expertise, knowledge and skill are not available here in Ontario.

There is nothing in the budget that recognizes this fact. What the Ontario Liberal Party would do would be to parallel the federal investment tax credit for R and D carried out in Ontario. For instance, a four per cent Ontario tax credit would be roughly equivalent to the 10 per cent federal credit that is now available. The April 1983 federal budget announced the extension of the carry-forward and carryback provisions to seven years and three years respectively. Ontario could parallel these measures.

As well, we see an expansion of the definition of R and D. The definition should not apply strictly to pure R and D, but should be expanded to include costs related to preproduction planning, trial production, troubleshooting and engineering follow-through. This would make the R and D incentives more desirable and would emphasize practical applications for the marketplace. Let us get the products developed and into the market.

Obviously part of any strategy for the Ontario economy has to deal with capital formation. We were glad to see the extension and expansion of the small business development corporation program. But obviously the continued formation of pools of capital is absolutely necessary to economic growth and security in this province. Further, this capital must be used in innovative ways. Innovation is the engine of economic growth, and the government can help by designing policies that put resources in the hands of the innovators in our society.

It is interesting that because of the recession,

people have been thrown back to a large extent on their greatest resource, themselves. An unprecedented number of corporations has been formed, and people are coming forward with ideas. That we applaud, and we think it should be encouraged.

We applaud the government's decision to increase funding to the small business development corporation program, but we ask: "Has the government gone far enough? Are we stifling some of our most creative entrepreneurs when the government spends only \$30 million on this worthwhile program whose benefits extend throughout society, but \$40 million is used in advertising and self-congratulatory praise?"

We must encourage grass-roots, public participation in the financing of our entrepreneurs. We need innovative policies to get the money out of the sock and into the hands of those who can help to create prosperity in society. The current tax system heavily favours the issue of debt rather than equity. We need fiscal policies that will put debt and equity on an equal footing. For instance, capital is so crucial to our future that this issue might have been a discussion paper within the budget or attached to the budget rather than a discussion about doing away with the home shelter program that is going to hurt the poor. Instead, we should be looking forward and thinking of these things in a sophisticated way. We do not see this in the budget.

We might have had a paper discussing whether we should allow individuals to make equity investments and defer capital gains tax as long as the equity was rolled over and was put forward. This is the type of policy that might encourage the formation and retention of a strong capital base. These are the kinds of ideas we might consider. We might have had a discussion paper considering doing away with or partially reducing Ontario's portion of the capital gains tax. We might have had a discussion about those things, yet these matters were not put forward by the Treasurer as being of any import.

Ontario should move to implement the Toronto Stock Exchange proposal for a junior exchange. I am sure my friend the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Bernier) would agree with that. He knows that when the government, in conjunction with the Securities and Exchange Commission, did away with junior stock promotion in Ontario it hurt a lot of small entrepreneurs, in northern Ontario particularly. Small investors could infuse desperately needed capital directly into those ventures, which carry not only the

greatest risk of failure but also the greatest opportunity for substantial economic growth, again in northern Ontario in particular.

In order to further encourage capital formation for high-risk ventures, the government could also consider exempting the capital gains of junior equity issues from Ontario income tax and could press the federal government to do the same. These matters should be considered.

The Ontario Securities Commission has pointed out in the past that there is virtually no mechanism for small and medium-sized business to raise relatively small amounts of capital from the public. Ontario desperately needs to revamp securities legislation to get the capital out of the socks of the province and into stock—a phrase that has already been used—and into the productive investments we need. Obviously, if we were to do these kinds of things, those very jobs that the Treasurer says will be created at some time in the future, but we do not know when, would come as a result of these suggestions.

I want to touch briefly on job retraining and the human resource. Today, about one half of the young people receive the necessary education or skills training in formal institutions. We know the private sector is not filling the gap, as over 70 per cent of business-provided training is for less than 26 weeks in duration and it does not build the long-term skills we need.

The Ontario Manpower Commission projects that we will be 45,000 skilled tradesmen short by 1986. The current government-sponsored apprenticeship program is abysmal. Less than six per cent of young people started an apprenticeship program and less than three per cent managed to complete their apprenticeship. Last year only 1,358 apprentices actually graduated. Yet since the late 1960s and early 1970s we have heard about what a great job we are doing in Ontario.

The budget does not even acknowledge that a problem exists. A token \$14 million is allocated through the Board of Industrial Leadership and Development to manpower training. Is this thinking for the long term? We need a comprehensive system to determine where the opportunities will be in the future and to disseminate this information to those who are making career choices.

We must send secondary school guidance counsellors into the real world so they can return to the secondary schools and help our young people make intelligent career choices. The current nonsystem offers virtually no help to the teenager making decisions that will affect him or her for a lifetime. The government must

make a concrete commitment to the training of highly skilled blue-collar workers. Last year the government spent \$185 million on manpower training and \$2 billion on colleges and universities. Both training grounds are vital if we are to position ourselves for the future.

3:40 p.m.

This budget has sinned in this regard by omission rather than by commission. In failing to provide the long-term skills our economy and young people so desperately require, we are creating a powder keg that can explode at any moment. This area once again shows that the government of this Premier has turned its back on the future. It is saying that our economy is in retreat and that our young people, who are entering this world with no marketable skills whatsoever, are those left in the cross-fire.

If there is one priority the government must bring to the budget-making procedure it is the commitment that funds must be invested in the most important resource we have, the residents of Ontario. Without this commitment the budget is failing its most basic responsibility, and the route to prosperity is destroyed. This budget has failed to make that commitment.

I want to speak very briefly about some of the sectoral problems of our economy that again were not addressed at all. Obviously the automotive sector is one of the primary sectors we have to deal with. The automobile and automotive parts sector remains our single largest industrial sector. At its peak in 1978, 110,000 workers were directly employed. Unfortunately, by 1982 this number had dropped substantially to approximately 97,000.

Some carefully considered action is required if we are to keep this sector vibrant. Since the 1975 signing of the auto pact agreement with the United States, Canada has run a net surplus only three times. A renegotiation of this important trade agreement is required. With Japan we are running a trade deficit in the auto sector of over \$100 million every month. The auto parts sector, made up of many independent Canadian manufacturers, is hurting particularly. In 1982 the auto parts sector had a \$4.2-billion deficit with the United States.

It is time we considered bringing into place a graduated domestic content restriction. Our goal is to achieve a minimum of 65 per cent domestic content in the automotive parts sector. It is time the Ontario and Canadian governments started playing hardball in this absolutely vital sector.

I turn now briefly to agriculture. This budget,

as my colleagues have pointed out, does nothing to give Ontario farmers any confidence in the future of their industry. It fails to provide any sense of direction to farmers at a time of greatest need. Our farm sector is most vital to Ontario, and yet we find little direction and few resources extended to this part of our economy.

The budget offers farmers \$35 million less than last year. Agricultural budgetary expenditures are to remain at 1.09 per cent of total budgetary expenditures, the same level as two years ago. The minister's argument that we cannot compare this year's decrease in the overall budget allocation to last year or even to two years ago because of the extraordinary expenses for emergency assistance in those years is a clear indication of the government's failed ad hoc approach to agriculture. Inadequate long-term commitments to agriculture lead to instability and the need for emergency assistance.

What is seriously required in this province is a long-term strategy for agriculture within which farmers can make their decisions. Ontario farmers cannot hope to survive if they are left to plan on a year-to-year basis.

The government's commitment of \$295 million to the whole agriculture industry pales in the light of the \$533 million that will be collected by the tobacco tax alone. Almost twice as much is collected in the tobacco tax as is expended by this government on agriculture. In comparison, the Quebec budget of two days ago promised farmers \$402.4 million next year. That is \$8,358 per farmer in Quebec as opposed to \$3,578 per Ontario farmer.

The only major announcement for farmers in this budget is a beginning farmers program, which we in this party have been demanding for years now. Even this announcement, however, is really a carryover of a promise made in last year's budget. We have yet to see the details of this program and we will reserve judgement until we do. I hope, however, as my colleague the member for Huron-Middlesex (Mr. Riddell) has put it to the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Timbrell), this program will be made retroactive to include recent entrants into the agriculture industry and the program's criteria will be broad enough to accept loans outside of farm credit corporations.

We are also concerned that this budget contains no announcement of increased financial assistance for the Ontario Veterinary College.

We are disappointed that, while tile drainage is essential for the improvement of Ontario's

food land and an additional 2.9 million acres are still in need of improved drainage, the funds allocated for that purpose for next year will be reduced by \$6 million from last year. Instead of reducing these funds, the government, we believe, should be providing up to \$50 million per year and should cover 75 per cent of the cost of the drainage work as opposed to the present 60 per cent. We are glad to see, however, the government took our advice and reduced the interest rate under this program to eight per cent.

We are disappointed also that there was no announcement in the budget to expand the guidelines under the Ontario farm adjustment assistance program. Very little of the government's announced \$80-million allocation for this program will be spent if changes are not made. Only about \$18.8 million has so far been spent and \$20 million from last year's program has been carried over to next year because it was underspent. We believe the guidelines under this program must be relaxed to allow producers under 10 per cent equity to be eligible, and the interest rate should be subsidized from the current 12 per cent down to eight per cent.

We currently import about \$2.3 billion worth of agriculture and food products into Ontario each year but there is no mention of an import substitution program. We could create thousands of new jobs in the agricultural industry by displacing these unnecessary imports. There is no announcement of any program that would develop the agricultural potential in northern Ontario even though the government has announced marketing studies to examine this question since 1977.

What the budget has announced, however, is an increase in Ontario health insurance plan premiums of which farm families must pay 100 per cent, which will cost them \$2.6 million extra per year. The present emergency economic difficulties facing the agricultural industry in Ontario are directly related to the lack of commitment and direction given to this vital industry and underline the failures of years of Tory misrule.

The only time one hears of any dedication to agriculture by this government is during an election. Then one hears promises such as those in the last election to drain and develop one million acres of land in northern and eastern Ontario or to move the stockyards out of downtown Toronto. These promises have never been kept. Each election is filled with promises simply to cover another crop of failures. The

rest of the time is spent blaming the federal government.

I also want to refer to northern Ontario and in particular to our mining, forest and tourism sectors. It was interesting that today questions were put about northern agriculture. We were promised some kind of policy relating to one-industry towns in northern Ontario. This was not addressed in the major and only economic statement we are going to get from the government this year.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure you will recall that the Brampton charter of 1972 promised to replace with at least two trees every one harvested henceforth in Ontario and to regenerate every acre harvested. The fact is that many northern Ontario communities are facing economic constraints in the near future due to shortages of timber. We are facing imminent timber shortages of crisis proportions due to years of government mismanagement which has permitted more trees to be cut than have been replaced. The total backlog of unregenerated cutover forest lands since 1971 is over 1.4 million acres and is growing at a rate of 180,000 acres per year.

3:50 p.m.

The years of government failure are starting to catch up with us. Of the 562,000 acres of total cutover in 1981-82, regeneration was undertaken on only 38 per cent of the land. Some 180,000 acres were left untreated, essentially written off. The government has allowed this resource to be mined rather than to be treated as a renewable resource. This record makes a mockery of this government's promise contained in the Brampton charter.

In the forest industry we would insist on sustained-yield management and the regeneration of all cutover lands. This would ensure adequate supplies to meet current demands and allow future expansion. Jobs would be created as part of an accelerated forest renewal program. Timber-cutting practices have to be changed, particularly with respect to the clear-cut.

We would expand the use of wood products to include biomass production of methanol. We could have an improved and accelerated forest cleanup program so that trees could be planted, we could expand our nursery stock and we could create, literally overnight, thousands of jobs.

We are spending about \$35 million on this program this year. All the experts have said we should be spending at least double that; in fact,

probably closer to \$100 million. Let us use the unemployment insurance commission funds constructively in our other programs. Let us put people in northern Ontario into productive work, improving the yield from our national crop, which is our forests.

Interjections.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Cousens): Order.

Interjections.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Oh, come now.

The Acting Speaker: The member for Rainy River, carry on please.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I want to touch as well on the housing program, or the lack of same, that was announced in the budget: \$40 million, of which \$16 million is going to be spent this year in demonstration projects. We have heard for the last two years—in fact we have rent control dating back to 1975 with the prices at that time—that there was not sufficient rental accommodation available, particularly in urban centres; yet there is very little in this budget to deal with that program some eight years later.

The government is claiming with this program that it will create some 5,000 units and 12,000 jobs; this, of course, is based on spending the whole \$40 million. But the facts and figures contradict each other. Unofficially, I have learned that \$10 million will be used for three experimental projects, creating fewer than 1,500 units. The Treasurer indicated in the lockup that the remaining \$6 million will be used for rent subsidies. Details have not yet been announced. Thus, the program cannot be evaluated beyond noting that it is an incredibly uncreative use of meagre funds and it does nothing to stimulate construction.

Ontario Liberal proposals for a rental housing stimulation program, which were released on December 20, 1982, were designed as a first step towards raising vacancy rates in major municipalities to three per cent. The cost was \$129 million, the number of jobs created 23,500 and the number of units built 13,350. The average cost per unit would have been \$9,700.

On May 14, 1982, the day after the budget, at an early morning press conference, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Mr. Bennett) unveiled Challenge 2000, composed of four programs: renter-buy; quick mortgage repayment scheme, which, of course, is not costing any real money; InnoRent—the price tag for these three is \$48 million; and Renthab, aimed at rehabilitating and preserving existing rental

housing. In addition, the government was to launch a series of demonstration projects designed to create new rental units from existing housing, with a price tag of \$10 million.

The \$58 million needed for these two programs was never allocated by the cabinet. The \$16 million in 1983-84 represents only 27.6 per cent of last year's promise, a promise that was never kept. Government has created an illusion that over a two-year period it has put \$98 million into rental housing construction proposals. In fact, at best we can hope for \$16 million this year.

The government also cut back on the Ontario home renewal program, which was of great benefit to people in rural areas and in the north. It cut back on that program, which was helping the elderly and the poor to rehabilitate their homes and bring them up to standard. Again, they suffer because this government really has no commitment to helping that sector of the population. The Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto and the Ontario Economic Council have suggested that the property tax credit program be redesigned to help people who need the help most. That fell on deaf ears this year, that is sure.

I want to speak briefly about employment and job creation once again and about the BILD program. The budget admits that the employment situation will continue to deteriorate. The unemployment rate for 1983 is forecast to be 11.7 per cent, compared with 9.8 per cent last year. On average, employment will drop by 37,000 and unemployment will increase by 93,000. The difference is a result of the increase in the labour force.

To deal with this problem, the budget announced \$242.3 million in programs to help create 76,000 short-term jobs. At first, this sounds impressive. However, last year the government was supposed to spend about \$226 million to create approximately 40,000 jobs. In fact, expenditures fell short by about \$10 million. This year's funding shows an increase of only \$16.3 million, or 7.2 per cent over last year's allocation. Yet average unemployment in 1983, according to the Treasurer's own estimate, will be up 21.1 per cent over 1982.

Though job creation funding is up only 7.2 per cent, the total number of jobs to be created has almost doubled from 40,000 to 76,000. Obviously, either the jobs will be of even shorter duration than last year or someone is inflating the numbers. The former may be happening—

we will not be able to tell until the programs are well under way—and the latter definitely is occurring.

In many cases, it would be difficult to shorten the average duration of jobs created under the various programs without totally destroying their effectiveness. Last year the average length of jobs created under the northern employment incentives program was 4.9 weeks. The average participant under the repair program for college, university and local school buildings cost the government \$577, hardly symptomatic of a major campaign to create jobs.

An expenditure of \$14 million to enrich manpower training programs by 9,100 positions is listed under the short-term job creation program. I welcome any increase in training efforts, even this pittance, since our party has been pushing the government to act in this area. But manpower training is not job creation.

Training expenditures are listed separately from job creation in expenditures by category in the budget, and manpower funding has never been included under job creation. To do so here is a blatant attempt to overstate what is actually being done in job creation as well as being naïve double accounting. When compared on an equal basis, job creation expenditures this year will be \$221.8 million versus allocations of \$226 million or actual expenditures of \$211 million.

Even using the most favourable measure, funding for job creation will increase only 5.1 per cent this year. The people of Ontario were not expecting that the five per cent restraint rule would be applied to the government's efforts to get the economy back on its feet.

4 p.m.

While on the topic of job creation, it is worth mentioning the fate of the Canada-Ontario employment development program. When the Treasurer announced the program in the House on November 22, 1982, he told us the federal-provincial actions would create 30,000 jobs. This year's budget reveals that the \$80 million to be spent on COED in 1983-84 will yield only 19,000 jobs, 5,000 fewer than would be expected on the basis of the Treasurer's estimate.

A check with Treasury officials found that the total cost of COED has now been revised downward because of higher costs. Since the Treasurer made such a commotion about announcing the original 30,000 jobs, I am curious why he did not stand in the House and tell us that 20 per cent of them had disappeared before they even got started because of his department's miscalculation.

There is one last area I wish to touch on with regard to job creation, namely youth employment programs. We are all aware that youth unemployment stands at 22 per cent at this moment and will rise over the summer. Fully one in four young Ontarians, more than 250,000 people, will be unable to find employment. I am sure the Treasurer will not deny that the youth unemployment rate in the coming months will be an unbelievable eight points higher than last year's horrendous level.

The youth programs this government put in place in 1982 were an unmitigated disaster. I have already mentioned the Ontario youth employment program, which, through an administrative foul-up, had \$6.5 million left in its kitty after turning away hundreds of willing employers and thousands of eager and needy young workers.

But OYEP was not the only failure. Youth programs listed in last year's budget were supposed to create 93,000 jobs, but the current document tells us that only 75,000 positions were achieved. It is ludicrous that in a year when youth unemployment soared to unprecedented heights, the Ontario government fell 18,000 jobs, or 20 per cent, short of its already inadequate goal.

Whether or not this year's target will be achieved we shall have to wait and see. However, the important fact is that the target itself is far too low. The government is aiming to create fewer than 101,000 jobs for young people, or fewer than 8,000 more than last year. I will say here and now that 8,000 jobs will not even deal with half the additional unemployed in the first month of this summer, much less the year-long plight of our youth.

There is much in this budget that speaks of the government's lack of vision for the future, but something more direct than this shameful abandonment of those who will mould our future cannot be found.

I want to touch on the tourism sector. One of the major shortcomings of this budget is its failure to deal with our tourism sector in a year that followed the first deterioration we have experienced in our provincial tourism deficit after years of improvement. Our tourism deficit had been progressively shrinking, to \$392 million in 1980 and \$328 million in 1981, but in 1982 this trend was reversed and our preliminary estimates indicate that the deficit could be well over \$400 million once again.

Our tourism revenues were much lower than expected last year when one considers such

factors as the exchange on the dollar, which should have attracted more American tourists and kept Ontarians at home, and a substantial expenditure on our promotional budget.

Ontario's tourism industry may well be one of the brighter spots in our economy, but tourism on a worldwide basis has been expanding at such a rate that it is expected to be worth \$120 billion globally by the year 2000 and certain to be the largest industry for this province. Given this growth in the tourism sector throughout the world in the past decade, Ontario's share of world tourism expenditures actually fell from 4.2 per cent to 2.7 per cent. In reality, then, while millions more people visited Ontario this year than a decade ago and spent billions more dollars here, our share of potential visitors to Ontario decreased.

The point here is, if Ontario had maintained its share of the world tourism market since the early 1970s, our economy would be richer by \$850 million, the provincial government's revenues would be \$375 million higher and, most important of all, perhaps 58,700 more jobs would have been created for Ontario.

Tourism Ontario made a pre-budget presentation to the Treasurer in which a number of recommendations were made to improve our tourism sector.

One of these dealt with a 10 per cent licensed trade discount on all purchases of beverage alcohol and 15 per cent on domestic wines. When a consumer purchases a bottle of liquor from a Liquor Control Board of Ontario outlet his price is made up of the basic selling price plus the retail tax, currently 10 per cent but which this budget will increase to 12 per cent.

When the owner of a licensed establishment purchases the same bottle of liquor, he pays the basic selling price minus a five per cent licence fee discount plus the 12 per cent gallonage tax. As a result, the price differs from the consumer price by only about three per cent. However, when he sells a drink in his establishment he must add on the 10 per cent retail tax and submit that as well to the provincial government.

Compare this situation with licensees in the US, our closest competitor, who may benefit from volume discounts when they purchase liquor. It is one factor that immediately places our hospitality industry at a competitive disadvantage with our closest neighbour.

I took the time in last year's budget reply to point out some actions that could be taken by this government for the benefit of our tourism sector. I want to repeat some of them because

one suggestion was actually picked up, the realignment of ministries to form the new Ministry of Tourism and Recreation.

Tourism is one of our largest employers, providing jobs for 541,000 Ontarians or about 14 per cent of our employed labour force. The participation of government in this sector is crucial since the industry is made up of over 30,000 firms, most of which are small but all of which need to advertise.

The government, therefore, assumes a very important role in co-ordinating this effort and promoting the industry as a whole. The government, however, has failed to provide the framework in which the individual tourist operator can carry on business. The industry is so over-regulated that tourism operators can find themselves dealing with as many as 14 provincial ministries.

That means up to 14 different ministers can all be making policy decisions without knowing how the decisions will affect the tourism sector. Without one person representing the tourism industry, many policy decisions have been made negatively affecting tourist operations. We had hoped this would be remedied with the appointment of the new Minister of Tourism and Recreation (Mr. Baetz).

I want to touch briefly on some of the suggestions we have to improve this sector of our economy. Some of these have been put forward by my colleague the member for Victoria-Haliburton (Mr. Eakins) in previous speeches.

We suggest taxing tourist resorts in a way that takes into account the fact that they may operate for only part of the year; implementing a full restocking program for our lakes, which would improve the attraction of fishing in our province; giving local travel associations a bigger voice in deciding how the provincial tourist advertising dollar is spent; using our community colleges more fully to improve the skills of those in the hospitality industry, and providing facilities in the soon-to-be-built Metropolitan Toronto Convention Centre for making reservations for resorts and attractions in any part of Ontario.

One final word on our promotional budget: While the "Yours To Discover" campaign may be paying substantial dividends and attracting tourists from targeted markets in Canada, bordering US states and overseas markets in Britain, Germany, France and Holland, we have to work even harder today just to maintain our position in these markets.

We must never forget we are living next door to the most successful promotional campaign

ever with "I Love New York." In addition to that, the state of New York increased its aggressive tourism marketing budget by 17.5 per cent in 1982, and Michigan augmented its impressive tourism budget by a remarkable 50.9 per cent. Given all of this, the only measure affecting the tourism sector in this budget is a negative one: an increase in the purchases by tourists eligible for the retail sales tax rebate to \$100.

4:10 p.m.

Given the multiplier effect of tourism spending on the provincial economy and the impact of this sector on employment, any stimulation of this industry can have profoundly beneficial effects. This budget is sadly lacking in this area of stimulation, and we will continue to press for such measures for this sector. Considering the number of jobs that could be created in the tourism sector, particularly for our unemployed youth, it is almost criminal that this particular sector is not taken note of in this budget at all.

I have a number of comments to make on the Board of Industrial Leadership and Development program. I am not going to go over the BILD program; it has been completely discredited. There is no one in Ontario who believes it was anything more than an election ploy, which unfortunately worked. But it has no credibility, the Treasurer has no credibility when he talks about it and neither he nor the Premier can even keep a straight face when they talk about the "bilge" program.

It is interesting. This is supposedly the cornerstone of whatever economic policy this government has, and yet the funds in that program have gone up all of \$9 million over last year.

Mr. Bradley: But you have to be fair. It has been good for the sign-painting industry.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Yes, a lot of ministers have had their names painted on signs; that in fact is true. But there is no one, from the chamber of commerce to anybody anywhere else, who believes that as an economic strategy, as an economic document, it is anything but a bunch of warmed-over programs previously announced and with money previously allocated under other budgets.

I had intended to talk about the deficit in financial stewardship. It is interesting that nine cents of the taxpayer's dollar used to go to pay the interest on the provincial debt. In one year that has risen from nine cents to 11 cents, so that for every dollar the taxpayer puts into the pockets of the Treasurer he is paying 11 cents of

interest—completely unproductive. That is an increase of over 20 per cent.

I asked the Treasurer during question period and he pretended not to understand the question. We understand that we have to run deficits in times of recession and bad years, but I think the people of Ontario are entitled to see that they are getting something for that deficit in job creation and in jobs for our unemployed, both our youth and the rest of the population.

This is an unproductive deficit. The taxpayers are still paying for Suncor and Minaki Lodge; for the overblown cabinet we have and the limousines that go with it; for the \$40 million in advertising by the government, a good half of which is for self-congratulatory pap; and for the land banks that we are still holding on to.

Somebody asked me the day the budget came out, "Should the Treasurer resign because of the leak?" I think he should resign not because of the leak but because this is an abysmally bad budget.

I tried to put forward some creative, innovative and, we think, constructive ideas for improving things in Ontario, particularly for the future but also for the short term. I have tried to be constructive and I have tried to be positive, as we always are in the Liberal Party. I have said there are things in the budget that we agree with and applaud.

There are a few things, unfortunately, that we do not agree with. I am not going to spend a lot of time talking about the Ontario health insurance plan premiums. I am not going to spend a lot of time talking about the increase in personal income tax. I am not going to talk about the social services maintenance surtax.

Interjection.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Tell us about the \$45 million, a good half of which the government wasted on Minaki?

It has long been the position of this party that we would eventually like to see the Ontario health insurance plan premiums phased out and that there be a charge on the consolidated revenue fund through personal income tax. We realize that is not going to be done with a stroke of a pen, but we wonder if the Treasurer has not launched us in that direction with his five per cent social services maintenance surtax.

I must say to the Treasurer that I do not know if my colleague on my left was listening to me the other day or not, but I think its title is demeaning both to the Treasurer who presented it and to the people at whom, presumably, it is aimed. I frankly think it verges on

Archie Bunkerism or that kind of thing. I will leave it at that, but I really believe the Treasurer is a much more honourable person than that. I believe someone has slipped that into the budget and I find it quite distasteful.

It is distasteful because it points out or points at a particular segment of our society, generally those who need assistance the most and who should not be singled out in a budget any more than anybody else.

Second, even worse than that, is probably the fact that the Treasurer, who prides himself on being honest and direct, which I believe he is generally, has stooped to such a subterfuge to say that he is imposing a temporary surtax. He knows and has said himself—and I have all the quotes here to prove it—that all the money that is collected goes into the consolidated revenue fund.

There is no such thing as particular taxes earmarked for a particular program. There never has been. It has been the position of the government, and I think rightly so, that it be that way.

What the Treasurer is trying to do is smudge and fog the issue when in fact he is simply doing nothing more than increasing personal income tax. That is all he is doing. He is trying to set up a smokescreen and perhaps have people pointing their fingers at one segment of society, a straw man that he puts up, because he was afraid to admit honestly, for once, that he had to raise personal income taxes. It is as simple as that. But we are again concerned about the temporary nature.

I do not have to tell the Treasurer because I think he, as a veteran of the Boer War, was around during the First World War when the personal income tax was first brought in. It was going to be a temporary measure. After April 30, ask anybody who has filled out his income tax if that was a temporary measure.

Interjection.

Mr. T. P. Reid: I think the minister is more of a bore than a Boer.

We are concerned about the corporation tax and the processing tax. We are not sure that those are appropriate in times of recession. It bothers me that the Treasurer seems to be convinced we are out of the recession, or coming out of it fairly rapidly. I do not believe that is the case. I think this five per cent surcharge on OHIP premiums and the eight to one ratio that my leader mentioned are going to abort the consumer-led recovery that he has talked about.

I want to go off on a bit of a tangent for a moment because I was completely baffled listening to the news last night, then reading in the media this morning, to learn that the Treasurer, one day after he announced his budget for 1983-84, is talking about having a mini-budget in the fall. We have not even digested this one and he is talking about a mini-budget in the fall. This is big news, for some reason. It really boggles the mind. It may well have been another smokescreen he was putting up.

4:20 p.m.

If the Treasurer is trying to create a climate of confidence and stability, surely to say one day after he tabled his budget, "I probably will have to change all this and none of this is going to make much sense six months from now," is hardly creating a climate of confidence and stability. Perhaps he really thought about how bad this budget was and decided he would have to bring in another in the fall to refurbish his image.

Incidentally—probably this is closer to the truth—the Treasurer may simply be picking up on my idea that at least twice a year—once in the budget and at one other time some six months after his budget—we should have a statement of the economic wellbeing or otherwise of the province so we will know exactly where we are going. It is deceitful for the government to table estimates in this House and table a budget and then cancel programs without announcing it has done so, as it did in last year's budget.

I have tried to be positive and constructive; I have put forward a few ideas but I am more interested in the general philosophy and thrust. In my remarks I have tried to look to the future and where we are going to be for the balance of the 1980s and into the 1990s. I have suggested we have to do something about productivity and the government has a role in that. I have suggested some job creation areas that should be looked into and acted on quickly, and that there are particular problems in some of our economic sectors which can be dealt with in an innovative way. I have tried to be constructive in looking at and positioning Ontario so we can take advantage of the opportunities that will be ours in the rest of the 1980s and 1990s.

We in this party are concerned about the future. We are concerned that the government that has been in power for 40 years seems to be more concerned about looking backward than forward.

The Acting Speaker: Mr. T. P. Reid moves, seconded by Mr. Nixon, that the motion that this House approves in general the budgetary policy of this government be amended by deleting the words following "that" and adding thereto the following—do I have the approval of the House to dispense with the reading?

Mr. McClellan: No, we want to hear it.

Mr. Rae: Read it out.

The Acting Speaker: I would be pleased to read it.

"This House deeply regrets the 1983 budget fails to recognize the most serious and fundamental problems facing the province of Ontario today and condemns the government for:

"Ignoring the continuing plight of the more than half-million unemployed Ontarians, neglecting in particular the desperate prospects faced by hundreds of thousands of idle Ontario youth, by refusing to introduce any serious long-term job creation programs nor any significant job training proposals;

"Ignoring the serious structural economic deficiencies plaguing Ontario's industrial infrastructure, neglecting in particular the need for a sound and thoughtful vision of Ontario's economic future for the rest of the 1980s and beyond, relying instead on short-term and short-sighted Band-Aid measures;

"Introducing yet another series of inequitable and unfair tax increases, and at the same time increasing the provincial deficit, thus punishing the citizens of Ontario for such wasteful government excesses as the Suncor purchase, the land banks, Minaki Lodge, government advertising, government polling and the practices of Ontario Hydro, among others;

"Ignoring or reducing the provincial commitment to such important sectors of our economy as agriculture, tourism and the auto sector;

"Threatening our social services with the prospect of cutbacks while a plethora of government excesses continues to be funded;

"Ignoring or reducing the provincial commitment to northern Ontario and environmental protection in this province;

"Ignoring the crucial issue of productivity across all sectors of our economy;

"Producing a budget which is unfocused, without direction, contradictory in its proposals and offering little hope for the thousands of Ontarian citizens suffering during the current recession;

"Therefore, this government lacks the confidence of this House."

Some hon. members: Well read.

The Acting Speaker: Thank you. The honourable members are very kind.

Mr. Cooke: Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to have the opportunity to lead off the remarks for the New Democratic Party and our reaction to a budget that is—

Mr. Samis: Boring.

Mr. Laughren: Boring.

Mr. Cooke: —boring and I guess in many ways maintains the momentum that was established by the throne speech earlier this year.

I must indicate that last year when we gave our budget responses, the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) was several thousand miles from Ontario. This year, for most of the response of my colleague from the Liberal Party, he was just several hundred feet from the Legislative Assembly and most of the members of the Conservative Party again are not in attendance for the budget debate.

I must again, and I have said this several times, state how dissatisfied I am with the process this Legislature is following. We just do not take this place seriously and, on the most important document that is presented before the Legislature and us, who represent the people of Ontario, the members of the Conservative Party are satisfied simply when their honourable whip tells them to stand up and vote. They do not think it is their role to participate in the debates and listen to the opposition positions on these very important matters.

Once again I just want to put on the record that I think they are contributing to the downfall of a very important process in this Legislature, and the members of the cabinet, the so-called leaders of that party, should be somewhat concerned about their back-benchers.

4:30 p.m.

I want to make a few comments. I probably will not take all of my time on the budget that has been placed before us and the people of Ontario.

At a time when we needed imagination, we received instead a budget that can only be described as bland. At a time when we needed action, we received inaction. At a time when 750,000 people needed hope, they received a budget that gives them nothing but hopeless-

ness. At a time when we needed jobs, we received virtually no jobs. At a time when nearly 250,000 young people in the province are unemployed, we received at most only 28,000 jobs—and that is not even 28,000 man-year jobs.

This government seems to be satisfied with real growth of only 1.9 per cent, with an unemployment level of 11.7 per cent and with the reality that there will be 37,000 fewer jobs in Ontario in 1983 than there were in 1982.

This budget means that average unemployment will remain at an incredibly high level—535,000 people—and the real unemployment level will continue to run at nearly 800,000 people in this province. Yet the Treasurer describes this budget as realistic.

The budget talks about the recovery, but the reality is that for nearly 800,000 people in this province there is no recovery; and there will be no recovery as long as this government is in power.

The statistics show also that there is no recovery at this point. So far, the figures for January and February of 1983 show a 31 per cent increase in layoffs over 1982 levels. Those figures are from the Ministry of Labour.

The budget restates a faith in the private sector and refuses to accept that the public sector has any active role to play in creating economic development and wealth in this province.

I would like to read a couple of letters into the record, one from my own riding and one that was sent to the member for Scarborough West (Mr. R. F. Johnston).

"Dear Mr. Cooke:

"As a welfare recipient with a wife and two children, I am a welder with 10 years' practical experience. I have just completed a course at the Industrial Resource Centre in Windsor to upgrade my skills to that of a fitter-welder, third-year apprentice. Included with my study, I earned certification from the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations, technical standards division, pressure vessel branch, as a high-pressure pipe welder.

"When I went to the Industrial Resource Centre, courtesy of the Canadian government, my area was and still is considered to be a critical trades area. With co-operation from Canada Manpower and local industry, students—including myself—were led to believe that although no promises were made, employment would be readily available for successful graduates.

"I was successful. However, there are no jobs

available to me, even though I was and still am prepared to relocate anywhere in Canada.

"The government also has an incentive program for employers ready to continue my training: the critical trades skills training assistance for employers.

"I have attempted to seek employment but was unable to even obtain application forms, let alone an interview, at which I could introduce myself and my skills.

"I am also listed with Canada Manpower for a position under the NEED," new employment expansion and development, "program and, thus far, no jobs have been forthcoming.

"My question to Mr. Axworthy"—this was originally written to Mr. Axworthy, with a copy to me—"is, if the welding field is a critical trade area, where is the shortage?"

The fact of the matter is, this young man in the city of Windsor has gone through for training, he is a skilled tradesman in a so-called critical skills area, and still no jobs exist in this province for him.

Here is a letter addressed to my colleague the member for Scarborough West:

"I am a 23-year-old, university-educated male who has been ungainfully employed for over a year. My political leanings are left of centre, although I have never voted for the NDP. I was brought up in Montreal but returning there is out of the question.

"I spent four very difficult years studying journalism at Carleton University. I supported myself since I was 16 to go to university. While studying I never managed to live more than \$2,000 under the poverty line. Me and many other students who were in the same situation didn't mind the hardship, however, because, perhaps naïvely, we considered our education as an investment for our future and would pay for itself many times over. As it turns out, nothing could be further from the truth.

"In November 1981 I got a job as a reporter with the Peterborough Examiner. After four years of post-secondary education I was making \$225 a week for sometimes as long as 50 or 60 hours. Conditions were deplorable. In January 1982 the Examiner newsroom was recognized by the Ontario Labour Relations Board as a local of the International Typographical Union. In March 1982 I was fired, I suspect no small part because I was a member of the union.

"Since March 1982 I remained unemployed. At the moment I have a temporary job filing at a Toronto law firm. That job ends at the close of business today." The letter was written in March.

"The financial problems of unemployment are well known to us all. In my case circumstances are not as bad as many. I don't have a family to support and I don't have any major debts. But my concern is the other problems that unemployment brings.

"My résumé will soon be on the best-seller list if any more copies are distributed. In our lives we must all experience rejection, but the feeling of going home day after day to a mailbox of rejection letters would discourage even the most hardy of us all.

"Of course, we all know that this is the worst possible thing; to find a job while you are discouraged is next to impossible. But how many times can you lie to yourself and say things will be all right when there is no indication that things will be all right?"

The letter goes on to describe this individual's feelings.

I suggest that these two individuals, along with thousands of others unemployed in Ontario, have no more prospect of a job today than they did at the beginning of this week, before the government brought down its budget.

This budget offers no vision, it offers no direction and it offers no hope. Instead, it says, "Corporate profits are on the rebound; so hold on, recovery will trickle down some time." For our party and for the people we represent and care about, that philosophy is completely unacceptable.

Let us go through some of the specifics of this government's job creation proposals; for example, the Canada-Ontario employment development program. They have a commitment in this budget that they will match any further federal money if any is coming; so it is an if-maybe-but program.

But there is old money in the budget under the COED program. I remember when the Treasurer announced the COED program. He said this money would be spent quickly and jobs would be in place very quickly. To date in Ontario, 5,000 jobs exist under the COED program. It is a disgrace at a time when there are 17,000 new welfare recipients every month coming off the unemployment insurance rolls and having to go on welfare.

Let me read some of the welfare statistics of various communities across this province to show how desperate the situation is.

In Chatham their welfare budget in 1980 was \$993,000; in 1983 they are projecting that their budget will be \$2.4 million—from less than \$1

million to \$2.4 million in just two years. The city of Brantford now has the distinction that four per cent of its population is on welfare.

In Sudbury there has been a 39 per cent increase in the welfare budget; in 1982 their budget was \$11 million, and this year they are projecting it will be \$15.4 million. In London their budget is up by 49.7 per cent for welfare this year over last year. In Hamilton-Wentworth there has been a 19 per cent increase in the welfare case load, and their budget this year is up by 20 per cent over last year's.

In Sault Ste. Marie there were 1,152 general welfare cases in December 1981; in December 1982 they were up to 1,670, a 45 per cent increase. But even more remarkable, their welfare budget for 1983 is up by 71 per cent over 1982's. In Kingston the case load is up by 9.9 per cent. In Kitchener, the welfare case load is up by 45.4 per cent.

In my home city, our case load has been increasing since 1978. The case load in December 1981 was 3,900 and in February 1983 it was 5,043, which is an increase of 24 per cent. I have a couple of other statistics to indicate how badly off that community is: in 1982 there were 625 personal bankruptcies and 145 business bankruptcies in Windsor.

4:40 p.m.

Communities in this province are suffering because of the inaction of this government. More and more people are being forced to go on welfare, which for many individuals in this province is the very last resort and something that requires them to swallow all their personal pride, to walk to the welfare office and apply for something that has a very negative stigma attached to it.

This government has not seen fit to do anything to try to turn around that situation by job creation. In fact, based on the budget statistics for the various municipalities, we are likely to see more and more people forced to go on welfare because there just will not be the job opportunities.

Let us take a look at this government's accelerated capital works program, which is supposed to be a job creation program as well. They say 12,000 jobs will be created, and they tell us \$246 million will be spent on capital works.

First, last year, when the accelerated capital works program was announced, \$133 million was the provincial share. Now this government presents us with a figure of \$246 million, as if it

were all provincial money. The reality is that only \$167 million is provincial money.

Then they tell us there are going to be 12,000 jobs created, but their officials in the lockup could not tell us how many man-years that is. They tell us it is going to be spent over two years, but for some reason all the jobs are going to be created this year. It really does not make a lot of sense. It is an indication of other aspects of this budget that lack some basic honesty with the people of this province.

Capital investment by this province as a percentage of total budgetary expenditures has fallen. To maintain even 1981 levels would require an additional \$430 million of expenditures by this province.

Unemployment in the building trades province-wide is more than 37 per cent. In some cities it is much higher. In Sault Ste. Marie, for example, it is 75 per cent. In Sudbury it is 64 per cent; in the Quinte-St. Lawrence area it is 75 per cent, and in the Essex-Kent region it is 60 per cent. Yet this government cannot see fit to create more than 12,000 jobs, the man-year equivalent of which we do not know, and it cannot see fit to bring up its capital works expenditures to the levels they were at in 1981.

We need those jobs now, and it would make much more sense for this government to get much more involved in capital works, to create jobs now and to build facilities that will be useful not only today but also for many years in the future. This type of investment cannot be looked at as a waste of government money or as make-work projects. Capital works investment is something that the government gets a return on as well as creating jobs now when we need them.

Youth employment: With nearly 250,000 young people unemployed in this province, this government comes in with a program of 100,000 jobs, but it does not tell us that in 1982 there were more than 75,000 jobs created under this program. In reality, they are putting only \$36 million more into youth employment in this province and at most they are creating only 28,000 new jobs, according to the figures they presented to us.

At a time when our young people are unemployed, not just for one or two months but for very long periods of time, and when our young people are feeling more and more alienated from society because they are not allowed to participate in or contribute to our economy, this is a miserly approach to youth unemployment

and does not take the problem seriously. This government is sowing the seeds of problems for years to come by not putting our young people to work today.

In housing, the last statistics show vacancy rates in Toronto were 0.7 per cent; in Hamilton, 0.6 per cent; Oshawa, 0.5 per cent; Thunder Bay, 0.6 per cent, and Ottawa, 0.2 per cent. Those are the vacancy rates in those communities, yet what does this government propose? It proposes a \$16-million program over four years to upgrade and rehabilitate 5,000 units. What a disgrace at a time when we need not only those jobs in the housing sector but also the housing units.

There are 10,000 senior citizens on waiting lists for social housing in Ontario and we can come up with only 5,000 units. This is after the government shut down or eliminated the Ontario home renewal program just a couple of months ago. The net amount of money being put into this program is practically nothing at a time when we have a housing crisis.

In the small business sector, this government pays lipservice to the small business people of this province. A tax holiday for small business is a great political gimmick. It certainly satisfied many small businesses that are profitable and incorporated, but it does nothing for those small businesses that are in trouble because they have experienced high interest rates and falling consumer demand in this province.

Over the course of this recession, the Canadian Federation of Independent Business said that across Canada we lost 700,000 to 800,000 jobs in the small business sector. If 40 per cent of those jobs are in Ontario, that means we have lost 300,000 to 350,000 jobs in the small business sector during the course of this recession.

The \$200-million tax giveaway to the profitable, incorporated small businesses would be much better used to help those small businesses in difficulty and to act as an incentive to create jobs in that sector of our economy.

This tax holiday was supposed to create 10,000 jobs in the small business sector, but ask the Treasurer today how many jobs were actually created and he will tell us, as he told me last December, that there has been no evaluation. As he said, acting like my father: "David, if you were ever in this position, you would institute taxes based not on what really works but on what your gut reaction is. My gut reaction was that this was a good tax expenditure; so we put it in place."

There was no attempt to evaluate it. From a government that is supposed to have good business practices, there was no attempt to see whether this tax expenditure was working and creating jobs. It was just the Treasurer's gut reaction. Perhaps he was hoping to get another dinner out of it as he did from the car salesman.

What we need in this province is a small business strategy that will plug the small business manufacturers into an industrial strategy, that will increase consumer confidence and consumer spending so there is activity in those corner stores, and that also, for the manufacturers, plugs into an automobile parts strategy, for example. The vast majority of our Canadian-owned auto parts firms are small businesses within this province. If we had a strategy in the auto parts sector, those businesses could benefit.

Instead, the only answer from this government to the problems of the small business sector is a tax holiday for what was two years and now is three years. The chances are that there probably will be a fourth year, because they will want to get past the next election without reimposing this tax.

In the agriculture sector, again this government talks a good line about its commitment to the farm community, yet in 1982, 43 per cent of farm bankruptcies were in Ontario where we account for only 25 per cent of Canada's farms. Since the last election, an average of three farmers have gone bankrupt every week in this province. In 1982 farm income dropped by 26 per cent.

The Ontario farm adjustment assistance program fails to address the problems of foreclosures and has assisted very few farmers in Ontario.

Ontario still lags far behind other provinces in terms of long-term credit programs. With inadequate returns for farmers, the problem will continue. So far this year there have been 47 farm bankruptcies, the same number we had in 1982. Last year there were 176 for the entire year. There is no reason to believe the same number of farms will not go into bankruptcy this year without a proper program from the government of Ontario.

The beginning farmers program announced by this government in its budget is a program our agriculture critic has called for, previously Donald MacDonald and now the member for Welland-Thorold (Mr. Swart). We have called for that program for many years and we congratulate the government for finally bringing it in. We look forward to seeing the details of that

program, but an awful lot still needs to be done in the agriculture sector of this province.

The tax changes announced in this budget again demonstrate the basic philosophy of the Conservative government of Ontario. The cost of the Ontario health insurance plan is up \$60 million or five per cent. A family now will be paying \$680 a year for health insurance and a single person \$340 a year; that is a 42 per cent increase since 1980. We have the distinction of being one of only three provinces that pay premiums and we charge by far the highest premiums in all of Canada.

The premium assistance program remains untouched in terms of levels of income to qualify for that program. We, along with Alberta and British Columbia, are the only provinces that continue to charge premiums. The so-called link between premiums and the cost of health does not exist. Even Mr. McKeough, the former Treasurer, admitted that back in 1978.

At the same time that premiums rise to pay for an overly generous settlement with the doctors of this province, we allow extra billing to continue in Ontario. Extra billing is a deterrent fee, a user charge that hurts those on fixed and low incomes the most. It should be stopped by this government immediately. Instead, not only does this government allow extra billing to continue but also it has the audacity to approve of it through the Minister of Health (Mr. Grossman).

If one is a low-income person or cannot afford these deterrent fees imposed by the doctor, he says, "Go talk to your specialist, go talk to your doctor and beg for charity medicine." That is what it boils down to. One has to go to his doctor if he is on welfare, is in a low-income bracket, is paid the minimum wage or is a senior citizen and say, "I cannot afford to pay your extra fee, so would you please not charge it to me?"

I thought charity medicine had gone out in Ontario when the health insurance scheme came in during the 1960s. This government is allowing charity medicine to creep back into the system at increasing and alarming rates.

The social services maintenance tax introduced the other day by this Treasurer is a part of the budget that I believe lacks honesty. This is simply a surtax that was introduced to raise revenue. It had nothing to do whatsoever with maintaining social services in this province. It had to do with the fact that this Treasurer wanted to increase taxes.

The Treasurer did not want to talk about any substantial increases in taxes for his corporate

friends. Instead, he wanted to bring in this surcharge, which hits people on low incomes the hardest by trying to give those people on low incomes the guilt trip that they have to contribute to those people who are drawing on the social services system of this province because of the recession.

That is exactly what this government is trying to do. It is a regressive tax, and it has nothing to do with the proposals this party made of a surcharge on net income of more than \$30,000. There is no parallel whatsoever. This surtax will kick in on incomes of \$7,500 for a single person and \$12,400 for a family. An individual who has a gross income of \$7,500 is going to have to pay this surcharge, the so-called social services maintenance tax.

What a disgrace in Ontario when we decide to put a surtax on those people who are at the lowest income level, many of whom work in the social services sector. For example, nursing home workers have very low incomes; this government, which put them under wage controls last year, now slaps a five per cent surtax on their income.

This particular tax demonstrates more clearly than anything else in the budget the philosophy of this government. I am very sorry this government decided to bring in this type of tax, and I can pledge that this party will be fighting this tax as hard as it possibly can.

I want to give just a few examples of the lack of honesty in this budget. As I have already indicated, the job figures that have been totalled up by this government are not real job figures, because they have not been put in man-years. They give the illusion that a few thousand jobs are going to be created, but the reality is that they are part-time, temporary jobs that will do virtually nothing to turn around the economic situation and the unemployment crisis.

The one aspect of this budget that is very dishonest, and it was raised in the Legislature today, is how the deficit is presented in the budget.

The Treasurer and other ministers have gone around the past few months announcing increases in transfer payments—in some cases percentages that have been ahead of inflation; for example, in the hospital sector—and tried to give the impression that these areas are now priorities for this government. After years of underfunding, they are now going to give adequate funding for one year.

Then they present a budget, the bottom line of which says the deficit will be approximately

\$2.6 billion plus \$300 million, which has to be squeezed out of transfer payments to achieve that \$2.6-billion deficit. The reason it was presented the way it was is that with the \$300 million as part of the deficit, as it should have been, it would have been reported as a \$3-billion deficit. And that is what we have.

I do not have any trouble with a \$3-billion deficit, as long as it is a productive deficit. I do not agree with the spending priorities, but I think the Treasurer, because of his philosophy, has great difficulty with even a \$2.6-billion deficit. He did not want the publicity of a \$3-billion deficit; so he played this new little gimmick in reporting whereby we can squeeze out another \$300 million. I think that lacks honesty with the people of Ontario and with the members of this Legislature.

I want to spend some time going through some of the proposals that this party outlined in a document called "Ontario Can Work" and released last week at a press conference in Toronto. The document defines economic recovery as one that has full employment as its goal. An 11.7 per cent unemployment figure is unacceptable, and our proposals were designed to create new jobs and to protect existing jobs.

In the job protection field we once again call for amendments to labour laws in three areas: (1) longer notice before mass layoffs or a shutdown, (2) universal severance pay, which is something we do not have in Ontario and, most important, (3) a process of justification before a plant can close down in Ontario.

Companies in this province now are allowed to close their doors with no explanation or justification to the community and to the workers. I want to give an example from my own riding. The Chrysler spring plant will be closing down in July 1983. They have been able to sell the idea that the plant is going to be closed, not because the plant is not profitable but because the plant can be more profitable—\$5 million more profitable—by relocating and contracting the work out to non-unionized plants in the sunbelt states in the United States. That is exactly what Chrysler is doing.

5 p.m.

The Minister of Industry and Trade (Mr. Walker) buys that line and has interpreted the \$5 million in increased profits as meaning that the plant is now losing \$5 million. But the plant is profitable; it always has been profitable. Yet it is going to move out because it can make \$5 million more. Why is it less profitable than a plant down in the southern states? Wages may

have something to do with it. What are we to do? Are we to lower our wages to the levels they pay in the sunbelt states and the right-to-work states?

The reality is that in the 60 years that plant has existed in Windsor, there has been virtually no investment by the corporation in new machinery. So, of course, productivity cannot compare with that in a brand new plant. The answer is not to close that plant down. The answer is not to allow it to close and lose for Ontario another auto parts plant and the 350 jobs associated with it. The answer for the corporation is to invest in that plant with new machinery to make it productive, make it competitive and increase the quality of its output.

The government cannot blame the workers who made concessions to that company in 1978 in order to try to save jobs. It cannot blame the workers when the company refuses to invest in its own facilities. A process of public justification would make those facts very clear to the community and to the government and would offer an opportunity to make a clear case for that plant and for 350 jobs for people in Ontario.

There are numerous other examples that have been brought up by my colleague the member for Hamilton East (Mr. Mackenzie). There are examples in Hamilton. There were numerous examples brought before the committee studying plant closures in the province, but that committee was not allowed to report because the election was called and the Tory majority refused to set up a new committee.

A process of justification is overdue in this province. We will continue to raise the issue of individual plant closings and layoffs in the hope that this government will some day see the light and bring in legislation to provide for justification.

With respect to youth unemployment, we called for a 25 per cent increase in student job programs. The cost would be \$16 million, and the total jobs created would be 89,000. We called for an increase in seasonal employment expenditures such as the Experience program. A 25 per cent or \$27-million increase would create 24,000 jobs.

In the area of forest conservation, we suggested teams of young people with supervisory staff be established in each of the Ministry of Natural Resources districts for forestry-related work. This program could be expanded as new seedling stocks and nurseries are established. Its cost would be \$20 million and it would create 1,400 jobs.

We suggested that a neighbourhood service

program be set up, again with teams of young people, funded to provide maintenance and home-related upkeep for the elderly and the disabled living at home. The cost would be \$8 million and 1,000 jobs would be created. It would not only provide the jobs, but it would be an important service to the elderly and disabled in this province. It is something we need and are eventually going to have to establish. Why not establish it now when we need the jobs?

In the area of energy conservation we suggested that in the regions of highest unemployment, teams of 30 young people be employed in residential energy conservation programs. Their work would be combined with classroom training in which they would learn to perform energy audits in residential homes. Such training will allow them to make recommendations on energy conservation in those homes. We suggest that 4,000 jobs could be created in that area.

We would use \$100 million of the \$200 million of the tax expenditure to provide a manufacturing wage subsidy to small business. We suggest that if the \$100 million was redirected to \$5,000 subsidies for hiring young people for a year, without displacing existing workers, then 20,000 jobs could be created for our young people in this province.

In those programs, with a little bit of innovation and a little bit of effort on the part of government, 140,000 jobs could be created for our young people in this province. We also suggested that the whole area of training has to be examined and, later in the budget debate, my colleague the member for Hamilton West (Mr. Allen) will present some of our detailed plans on training in Ontario.

In the area of accelerated capital works, this budget calls for \$167 million over two years. This does not even bring up the expenditures to 1981 levels as a percentage of budget expenditures, and it overestimates jobs. We suggested that at least \$300 million in new money should be put into accelerated capital works in this province. These investments today would benefit this province now and for many years to come. This proposal would realistically create 12,000 jobs in Ontario.

In agriculture, by increasing the tile drainage program and funding by \$25 million, agricultural productivity could be increased and 2,000 jobs could be created. Furthermore, we believe the \$3,000 grant provided to farmers for farm improvements is inadequate and we suggest that a \$25-million program to write down loans to

eight per cent would be more effective and create more jobs.

In the area of energy and conservation, the program we suggested would be directed towards encouraging and supporting the development of conservation and renewable energy sources. Such a commitment has the potential to create thousands of jobs. A residential energy conservation program, with Ontario Hydro acting as the agency with municipal utilities, should provide low-interest loans, technical advice, inspection services and follow-up.

Jobs would be provided across Ontario. Job creation examples would be 1,000 utility personnel to perform the energy audits, 8,500 construction-related jobs, 1,000 skilled trades jobs for the conversion to natural gas, 4,500 in insulation manufacturing, 800 in furnace manufacturing and 3,000 in other related conservation production. The job creation potential in this area is at least 18,000 to 20,000 jobs for a program that has the resources put behind it and for a government that wants to implement this type of program.

Again, this kind of a program is not a make-work program. It is a program that has long-lasting benefit because it means fewer people will be relying on oil, it means those who are still on oil will use less of it because of conservation methods, and it means we will not have to import as much and therefore there will be tremendous savings to the people of this province and to the country as a whole.

In the environment, a program of environmental remedial action is long overdue. Over one million tons of hazardous industrial waste are produced by Ontario industries every year. Every year, 1.6 million tons of sulphur dioxide are pumped into the atmosphere by Inco Ltd., Ontario Hydro and Falconbridge Ltd., and by the oil, pulp and paper and steel industries. Solving these problems presents significant opportunities for job creation in Ontario.

We suggest an environmental repair fund should be set up in this province. It would be funded by government and industry, and it would clean up five waste sites in the province—the Beare Road waste site, the Upper Ottawa site in Hamilton, the York Sanitation landfill site in Stouffville, the Eric Pauzé landfill site in Tiny township and the Uniroyal site in Elmira. We suggest the cost would be \$25 million, some of which would be funded by the industry. There is a potential of 1,500 jobs to be created.

We have suggested other environmental areas where jobs can be created, again with long-

lasting benefit to our province. The member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Charlton), our environment critic, will be explaining those in the course of the budget debate.

The housing sector was the most disappointing to the members of this caucus in terms of this government failing to take advantage of the opportunity that exists for job creation. There are 10,000 senior citizens right now waiting for rental units in Ontario. A program in this field, as well as in the co-op and nonprofit area, would meet an important need. Over 30,000 jobs could be created in the province. Again, the low vacancy rates that are a problem today provide this province with an incredible opportunity for job creation.

5:10 p.m.

There are other housing areas such as renovation. About 20 per cent of our housing stock in Ontario is 50 years old. A program of renovation and conversion to rental units where appropriate would create jobs, in addition to upgrading Ontario's housing stock.

Again, opportunities exist for job creation in health and social services. Our document proposed several programs in the health and social services field. They include child care, neighbourhood support, homemaker programs and nursing homes. I want to focus on one of our suggestions. The others will be dealt with by my colleagues the member for Bellwoods (Mr. McClellan) and the member for Scarborough West when they join the budget debate. All these people did not plan on speaking, but they do now.

The area I would like to address in the health and social services field is the nursing home sector. I became fairly involved in this area after my election in Windsor. I found nursing homes in this province were not providing the kind of care I expect them to provide, because the motivation in the nursing home sector is profit and not care. There can be simply no doubt about that when one tours the nonprofit homes for the aged and sees they provide much better care in Ontario.

We suggest the government has to get into nursing homes and nonprofit nursing homes in a big way. We need those beds now. There are people on waiting lists. In fact, in many areas of this province it takes a year to get into a nursing home. In the meantime, people have to remain in unregulated rest and lodging homes across this province, where the care, to say the very least, is inadequate.

We suggest there should be 2,000 nonprofit

beds provided in the nursing home sector in this province. We are not suggesting these beds would be run directly by the Ministry of Health. We are suggesting, instead, that church groups, municipalities and other community groups get involved in running these nursing homes and that government work with them, providing capital while they provide the care and maintenance in running these nursing homes.

I am convinced that in the long run, nonprofit nursing homes would not only provide better care for our senior citizens and others who need to be in nursing homes, but they would also be less expensive for the people of this province because the profit would be turned back into care for our elderly. Instead, the profit is taken out and given to the owners of the nursing homes. This is an area that would create 3,000 permanent jobs, and the capital funding for this program would come from our accelerated capital works program.

In the long term, we have to develop an industrial strategy in this province, not a political strategy such as BILD was, but a real industrial strategy. Ontario imports \$35 billion worth of manufactured goods every year. If we could replace just 15 per cent of that, 60,000 jobs would be created. We have deficits in food, in auto parts, in machinery, especially mining machinery, and in electronics. These problems, these deficits, represent significant opportunities for job creation in Ontario. Our proposal is for a \$5-billion investment over five years.

I want to focus on auto parts and food processing. Other parts of the proposal will be described later by other members of our caucus. We still have significant problems in the auto sector, even though we heard the Premier (Mr. Davis) in his summary of the throne speech say the auto sector has made a magnificent recovery. The fact is that in 1978, in Ontario, the UAW had 100,000 members in the auto sector. Now they are down to 79,000, and the working members are only 65,000. So 14,000 of those 79,000 are on layoff.

Thousands of auto workers in this province have lost their jobs and those jobs have gone permanently from our economy unless something is done to bring them back into Ontario. The reason the layoff numbers seem so low is that thousands of auto workers have lost their recall rights because they have been on layoff for such a long time. The reality is that the structural problems in the auto sector remain. They are there today just as they were in 1980 and 1981. We still have an incredibly weak auto

parts industry. We still have no research and development. We still have an assembly bias and we still have a bias in the work force towards unskilled workers rather than skilled labour.

The government proposal in the throne speech to bring the offshore companies under the same kind of rules as the auto pact in my view is a cop-out. It was only a year ago that the former Minister of Industry and Tourism, the member for St. Andrew-St. Patrick (Mr. Grossman), said we needed 100 per cent Canadian content. Now, a year later, they say they are willing to settle for 65 per cent and, for example, Chrysler and Ford are running around 50 per cent Canadian content in what they produce and what they sell.

What we need in this province from our Liberal colleagues at the federal level is content legislation, not just for the offshore auto makers, but content legislation that applies equally to the North American auto makers as well.

When that content legislation is brought in, there will be an increased demand for auto parts in Ontario. In order to take advantage of that increased demand for auto parts, we need to set up a crown agency, as we have suggested before. You are familiar with this, Mr. Speaker, because you are the one Tory who voted for my resolution. We need a crown agency that we would call AutoCan. You can call it whatever you want, but we would call it AutoCan.

AutoCan's purpose would be to get into joint ventures and co-invest with the Canadian-owned auto parts sector. It would be to get into research and development and joint ventures in the research and development field with the private sector and to build a process of Canadianization of the auto parts sector in Ontario. The potential for job creation in the auto parts sector, if content legislation was brought in, would be 35,000 jobs, most of which would be here in Ontario.

In the food processing sector we again are going backwards rather than forward. Between 1979 and 1982, imports rose by 57.5 per cent in Ontario and the trade deficit in food processing increased by 50 per cent. Two hundred million dollars worth of replaceable fruits and vegetables are brought into this province every year. That represents 9,000 jobs. We suggest a program should be set up and funds should be provided to small food processors throughout the province in existing or new co-operatives, small processors and canneries. In return, these Canadian companies would sign performance

guarantees and the money would be advanced through co-investments with the private sector.

A very real opportunity exists for a government that has the will to eliminate the trade deficit in the food processing sector in five years. I want to spend a few minutes talking about how this program should be paid for. This \$2-billion program for short-term job creation would create, as I have said, 150,000 jobs throughout Ontario. Of this \$2 billion, about \$400 million is composed of low-interest loans that would be paid back over time. In addition, some of the funds would come from redirecting existing commitments. Some would be provided by Ontario Hydro, for example, in the residential energy conservation program, and some directly through private sector contributions, such as in the work futures training program.

Another \$700 million would be offset by increased revenues, leaving less than \$1 billion in net addition to the deficit. The total deficit with our increase would be less, as a percentage of the gross provincial product, than the deficit in this province in 1975-76.

5:20 p.m.

Compare a deficit that would be close to \$4 billion under our suggestions to the costs of unemployment in Ontario. Under the present circumstances we lose \$11,265,000,000 in lost wages every year, \$1.5 billion in lost taxes, and \$4.7 billion in unemployment insurance benefits and welfare payments in Ontario.

We have a choice. We can invest now and put people to work in productive activities, or we can maintain high unemployment, low revenues and high deficits for many years to come.

The increased deficit we suggest is a productive deficit, one that adds needed facilities to our province. These are facilities that have to be built sooner or later, so it is not wasted money. It is money well spent for today and for tomorrow. A productive deficit also increases revenues for the government through direct and spinoff job creation.

In the area of taxation, I want to make several proposals. Over the last 30 years in Canada, the inequality of income share has remained remarkably constant. At present, as in 1951, the bottom 20 per cent of the population receives only four per cent of the income, while the top 20 per cent of the population captures more than 42 per cent of the income, which is more than the entire bottom 60 per cent of the population receives.

The distribution of wealth is even more unequal. The richest 10 per cent of Canadians

own 57 per cent of total Canadian wealth, while the lowest 40 per cent own less than one per cent of the total wealth in this country. A progressive tax system can mitigate some of these inequalities.

Under our current system, regressive taxes greatly offset the progressiveness of the personal income tax. We have sales tax, Ontario health insurance plan premiums and property taxes. Furthermore, the favoured treatment of investment income means wage and salary incomes are taxed at roughly double the rate of investment income.

This budget, along with the last two, has raised taxes in Ontario for families by about \$800 annually. The Lalonde Liberal budget imposes \$3 billion worth of additional taxes over the next four years. At the same time, the Lalonde Liberal budget proposes corporate tax cuts of about \$1 billion. This budget parallels some of those federal tax changes, therefore giving further benefits to the corporate sector.

We have examined a few areas in which we believe revenue could be raised, while at the same time providing more equality in the tax system. Canada ranks last of all Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development countries in terms of taxation of wealth. An annual net wealth tax is levied in the Scandinavian countries, West Germany, Austria, Belgium and Luxembourg. This tax is at an annual rate of between one and 1.5 per cent of net worth on an individual, in excess of an exemption level. This tax is applied in addition to succession duties.

Ontario does not even have succession duties. That tax was eliminated at the end of the 1970s. That tax raised \$75 million when it was phased out. We believe a tax on estate wealth should be reintroduced and a net wealth tax should be considered. The estate tax could raise \$100 million a year in Ontario and should be imposed in such a way as to avoid taxation of the family farm.

At present, the current tax treatment of dividend income and capital gains has resulted in a situation where many wealthy income earners effectively reduce their income rate to levels below what is paid by the average income earner. According to the federal Finance department, in 1979 there were 152,000 people filing tax returns who were identified as having incomes in excess of \$50,000 a year. Of these, some 3,400 had no tax liability. A further 21,300 were taxable but paid less than 10 per cent of their income in federal tax. There were 740 individuals with incomes over \$100,000 a year who had

arranged their affairs so that they paid no federal income tax. A 20 per cent surtax on only the taxable portion of capital gains and dividend income would raise approximately \$200 million in Ontario.

In addition, this government should be reviewing all its tax expenditures to business to determine if in fact they have been achieving job creation. I assume the only purpose for a tax expenditure to a business is to create jobs. They should be assessed to determine if they are. If they are not, then those tax expenditures should be plugged and we should redirect those funds so that jobs are created.

We believe that rather than introducing more and more tax expenditures we should be using a more direct approach of grants, joint ventures, loans and loan guarantees with performance guarantees attached to them. This provides for more accountability and an easy evaluation of success or failure. By raising other taxes such as capital tax on banks, trust companies and corporations to levels of other provinces, an additional \$110 million could be raised. These tax changes along with the increases in corporate tax announced in the budget would raise in excess of half a billion dollars for the province.

In summary, as a member of this Legislature I feel a great deal of frustration with this government. The reason I feel frustration is that when one examines the sectors of the economy—whether it be housing, auto parts, food processing, or mining and mining machinery—opportunities exist for jobs to be created, thousands of jobs. I am convinced that if the government took advantage of these opportunities, this province could achieve full employment.

But the fact is we have a government that no longer has the will to govern. It no longer has a vision for its people. We have a government that refuses to take advantage of those opportunities and create jobs for the people of this province. It is incredibly frustrating when one comes from a community that now has had over 20,000 people unemployed for going on five years; in my home town we have had over 20,000 people unemployed.

Every week we have people who come in and virtually beg us for jobs, assuming that we have connections to get people jobs. They have come to the point where they will go and see a politician, an MPP; they have become so frustrated and alienated and so completely lost and filled with despair that they will go to an MPP's office and ask if they can get connections in order to get a job. This happens weekly.

Then we come and hear a budget read to us that creates not even enough jobs to take care of 10 per cent of the people who are unemployed in the province. It is frustrating and disappointing. One can only hope that eventually the people of this province will see this government has completely collapsed. It is completely void of any direction and ambition to do what is needed for this province.

We in this party have a vision for this province. We see that full employment can be achieved in Ontario. We would dearly love to have the opportunity, and I believe we will have the opportunity to implement our programs. In the meantime, we will harp away each day at this Treasurer and this government and put our proposals forward, communicate with the people and hope and pray that some day the Treasurer and the rest of his government will see the light and implement the policies to bring about the economic growth we know can be achieved.

In conclusion, I would like to present our amendment to the motion by the member for Rainy River (Mr. T. P. Reid).

5:30 p.m.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Cousens): Mr. Cooke moves, seconded by Mr. Rae, that the amendment of Mr. T. P. Reid be amended by—should I dispense with the reading?

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker: Are you sure?

Mr. McClellan: Read it slowly.

The Acting Speaker: Mr. Cooke moves, seconded by Mr. Rae, that the amendment of Mr. Reid be amended by adding after the word "recession" and before the words, "Therefore, this government lacks the confidence of this House," the following:

"Continuing the government's slavish"—

Some hon. members: Slavish.

Mr. R. F. Johnston: Slaving and slavish.

The Acting Speaker: I apologize to all members of the House.

"Continuing the government's slavish adherence to the economic directions established by the Liberal government, policies which have resulted in the unemployment of hundreds of thousands of Ontarians;

"Ignoring the overwhelming evidence of the budget's own figures that the private sector in general and private sector investment in particular are not leading us to economic recovery, yet cutting back on vital public investment in

environmental protection, housing, health, social services, agriculture and the north;

"Failing to introduce a major program to assist the construction of co-operative and non-profit housing to create jobs and meet pressing needs for shelter;

"Failing to respond to the unacceptable levels of unemployment among young people and women with concrete proposals to create permanent jobs and comprehensive skills training programs;

"Failing to respond to the needs of older workers laid off or threatened by technological change by the establishment of a workers' training fund, improved layoff and severance pay legislation and pension reform;

"Increasing once again regressive OHIP premiums instead of shifting this unfair tax burden to an equitable tax source;

"Failing to reform the funding of health care in Ontario by banning extra billing and user fees;

"Abdicating completely its responsibility for the economic wellbeing of Ontario's people through its failure to introduce any long-term investment proposals to plan for our future."

On motion by Mr. Gillies, the debate was adjourned.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Hon. Mr. Gregory: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the government House leader, may I indicate the business of the House for tomorrow and next week?

Tonight and tomorrow, the budget debate; on Monday, May 16, in the afternoon, the budget debate; on Tuesday, May 17, in the afternoon and evening, legislation, with second reading and committee of the whole if necessary, as follows:

Any third readings on the order paper; Bills 32, 1, 25, 28 and 29 standing in the name of the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry); Bills 4, 5, and 13 standing in the name of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Elgie); and, if there is time, Bill 14.

On Wednesday, May 18, the usual three committees may meet in the morning.

On Thursday, May 19, in the afternoon, private members' ballot items 1 and 2 in the names of the member for Essex North (Mr. Ruston) and the member for Wentworth (Mr. Dean); in the evening, budget debate.

On Friday, May 20, beginning the estimates of the Ministry of Government Services.

The House recessed at 5:36 p.m.

APPENDIX

ESTIMATES TIMETABLE

(Estimates to be taken in order shown)

To the committee of supply—the Ministry of Government Services, four hours; the Ministry of Revenue, five hours; the Management Board of Cabinet, six hours; the Ministry of Northern Affairs, eight and a half hours; the Ministry of Intergovernmental Affairs, five hours; the Ministry of Treasury and Economics, six hours; the Lieutenant Governor, Premier and Cabinet Office, five hours.

To the standing committee on administration of justice—the Ministry of Correctional Services, seven hours; the Ministry of the Solicitor General, nine hours; the Provincial Secretariat for Justice, four hours; the Ministry of the Attorney General, 13 hours; the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations, 20 hours.

To the standing committee on resources development—the Provincial Secretariat for Resources Development, seven hours; the Ministry of the Environment, 16 hours; the Ministry

of Transportation and Communications, 15 hours; the Ministry of Natural Resources, 18 hours; the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, 15 hours; the Ministry of Labour, 22 hours.

To the standing committee on social development—the Provincial Secretariat for Social Development, five hours; the Ministry of Citizenship and Culture, five hours; the Ministry of Community and Social Services, 20 hours; the Ministry of Education, 14 hours; the Ministry of Colleges and Universities, eight hours; the Ministry of Tourism and Recreation, 10 hours; the Ministry of Health, 23 hours.

To the standing committee on general government—the Office of the Ombudsman, three hours; the Office of the Assembly, five hours; the Ministry of Agriculture and Food, 20 hours; the Office of the Provincial Auditor, three hours; the Ministry of Energy, 10 hours; the Ministry of Industry and Trade, 11 hours.

CONTENTS

Thursday, May 12, 1983

Oral questions

Miller, Hon. F. S., Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics:	
Job creation , Mr. Peterson, Mr. Cooke.	655
Consumer confidence , Mr. Peterson, Mr. Cooke, Mr. T. P. Reid.	656
Budget measures , Mr. Rae, Mr. Peterson.	658
Funding for pollution control , Mr. Rae, Mr. Elston, Mr. Charlton.	659
Public debt , Mr. T. P. Reid, Mr. Cooke.	660
Ontario property tax credit , Mr. Cooke, Mr. T. P. Reid.	661
Funding for northern Ontario , Mr. Foulds, Mr. Van Horne.	663
Income tax surcharge , Mr. R. F. Johnston, Mr. Boudria.	665
Assistance to farmers , Mr. Swart, Mr. Boudria.	666
Timbrell, Hon. D. R., Minister of Agriculture and Food:	
Assistance to farmers , Mr. Riddell, Mr. Swart.	662
Walker, Hon. G. W., Minister of Industry and Trade:	
Arena funding , Mr. Van Horne.	665
Welis, Hon. T. L., Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs:	
Television in Legislature , Mr. Bradley, Mr. Martel.	664

Motions

Estimates , Mr. Wells, agreed to.	666
Standing committee on resources development , Mr. Wells, agreed to.	666

First readings

Smith Bros. & Sons Limited Act , Bill Pr24, Mr. Kells, agreed to.	667
Ontario Loan Act, 1983 , Bill 34, Mr. F. S. Miller, agreed to.	667
Tobacco Tax Amendment Act , Bill 35, Mr. Ashe, agreed to.	667
Small Business Development Corporations Amendment Act , Bill 36, Mr. Ashe, agreed to.	667
Retail Sales Tax Amendment Act , Bill 37, Mr. Ashe, agreed to.	667
Corporations Tax Amendment Act , Bill 38, Mr. Ashe, agreed to.	667
Inflation Restraint Amendment Act , Bill 39, Mr. Peterson, agreed to.	667

Budget debate

Mr. T. P. Reid.	668
Mr. Cooke.	679

Other business

Estimates , Mr. McCague.	655
Estimates timetable , Mr. Wells.	655
Visitor , Mr. Williams.	655
Notice of dissatisfaction , Mr. R. F. Johnston.	666
Business of the House , Mr. Gregory.	690
Recess	690

Appendix

Estimates timetable.	691
---------------------------	-----

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Ashe, Hon. G. L., Minister of Revenue (Durham West PC)
 Baetz, Hon. R. C., Minister of Tourism and Recreation (Ottawa West PC)
 Boudria, D. (Prescott-Russell L)
 Bradley, J. J. (St. Catharines L)
 Charlton, B. A. (Hamilton Mountain NDP)
 Cooke, D. S. (Windsor-Riverside NDP)
 Cousens, D., Deputy Chairman and Acting Speaker (York Centre PC)
 Elston, M. J. (Huron-Bruce L)
 Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP)
 Gregory, Hon. M. E. C., Minister without Portfolio (Mississauga East PC)
 Johnston, R. F. (Scarborough West NDP)
 Laughren, F. (Nickel Belt NDP)
 Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
 McCague, Hon. G. R., Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet (Dufferin-Simcoe PC)
 McClellan, R. A. (Bellwoods NDP)
 Miller, Hon. F. S., Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics (Muskoka PC)
 Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
 Peterson, D. R. (London Centre L)
 Rae, R. K. (York South NDP)
 Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L-Lab.)
 Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
 Samis, G. R. (Cornwall NDP)
 Swart, M. L. (Welland-Thorold NDP)
 Turner, Hon. J. M., Speaker (Peterborough PC)
 Van Horne, R. G. (London North L)
 Walker, Hon. G. W., Minister of Industry and Trade (London South PC)
 Wells, Hon. T. L., Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Scarborough North PC)
 Williams, J. R. (Oriole PC)



Hansard

Official Report of Debates

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Third Session, 32nd Parliament

Thursday, May 12, 1983

Evening Sitting

Speaker: Honourable John M. Turner

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

Contents of the proceedings reported in this issue of Hansard appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of the speakers taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is \$15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, Information Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 965-2238.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Thursday, May 12, 1983

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

BUDGET DEBATE (continued)

Resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion that this House approves in general the budgetary policy of the government.

Mr. Gillies: Mr. Speaker, I seem to have drawn my usual large crowd tonight. I appreciate joining what is, I believe, the third budget debate in which I have taken part since my election some two years ago. In commencing this evening I would like to draw the attention of the honourable members to the presence in the gallery of some very distinguished visitors from Brantford.

Mr. Ruston: You can't do that.

Mr. Gillies: My good friend the member for Essex North is telling me I cannot do that, and I apologize now, having already done it.

Hon. Mr. Walker: What city are they from?

Mr. Gillies: From Brantford. The honourable minister is asking me where they are from.

We have some friends, supporters and members—at the risk of sounding a trifle partisan—of the Brantford Progressive Conservative Association, and I am just delighted that they were able to be with us this evening.

In commencing this brief speech tonight, I would like to commend the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) for the budget he has tabled with this House in the last number of days outlining policies that I believe effectively address the major economic problems of the day and that will help our private sector to take full advantage of, and build on the opportunities afforded by, improving economic conditions. I am confident that in tandem with other actions of our government this budget will be responsible for what will doubtless be a slow, but none the less steady, transformation of the current economic situation into a recovery of the economy of our province.

I would like to say at this time, and I think I speak for all my colleagues on this side of the House, that we have been very proud of the performance of our Treasurer in the last num-

ber of days. We recognize the difficult task the Treasurer and his staff had preparing and tabling the budget we now have before us. Meeting the deadline with the various complications that developed in the last number of days required, I know, an unusual effort on the part of the people in the Ministry of Treasury and Economics. I am sure that effort is appreciated by all members of the House.

Although I know this was the subject of an emergency debate last Monday in which I took part, I would like to reflect briefly on the circumstances that surrounded the preparation and presentation of this year's budget, as I fear that in some ways the substance of the budget has been overshadowed by the purported leak of some documents that were alleged to be part of the budget. The incident I am referring to at the print shop in this city has had serious implications for the preparation of budgets in the future. I think it has in turn had effects on what will be the future budgetary policies of the government.

I would like to make a few observations about the issues involved in the incident itself and the subsequent debate on those issues that took place in this House. The incident led many members opposite to demand the resignation of the Treasurer. It is our feeling on this side of the House that the Treasurer must remain in his post and continue to exercise his duties on behalf of the people of this province.

Mr. Nixon: That is not what he said.

Mr. Gillies: I am coming to that. There was some insistence the Treasurer must resign because of the dilemma in which the federal Minister of Finance found himself. I would like to make only two observations on that point.

First, the two cases in my opinion are so dissimilar that the situation prohibits any drawing of legitimate comparisons between them.

Mr. Wildman: More like comic books.

Interjections.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Cousens): Order.

Mr. Gillies: My friends over there are just reminding all my friends up in the galleries why they voted Conservative in the last election and

why that change may have been beneficial for them.

Mr. Wildman: You probably have as many friends in the gallery as you have over here.

The Acting Speaker: The honourable member's interjections will cease.

Mr. Gillies: I hope I have more friends in the gallery than I have over there.

The Acting Speaker: The member will speak to the Speaker.

Mr. Gillies: Mr. Speaker, I will speak to you.

The Acting Speaker: The members opposite will refrain from interjecting.

Mr. Gillies: I will try to ignore the interjections opposite.

In speaking again to the comparison between the situation the Treasurer found himself in and the situation Mr. Lalonde was in some weeks prior to that, it is obvious to any observer that Mr. Lalonde was in large part the cause of his own misfortune, and directly and immediately contributed to the leak of the federal budget. I do not believe those conditions hold in the case involving the Treasurer of Ontario. The members of all parties, in fairness, should acknowledge there is an obvious and important difference between the two cases and govern their statements accordingly.

One has only to read the letters to the editors of our various newspapers to appreciate that the public is very supportive of the Treasurer in this case. In my opinion, it would be a great shame indeed if the province were to be deprived of a man of his undoubted abilities and talents, someone who has in the last 12 years contributed greatly to the public life and administration of this province.

8:10 p.m.

I and the members of our caucus, therefore, urge the Treasurer not to resign and, if such a resignation should be tendered, we urge the Premier (Mr. Davis) not to accept it. There is nothing in this unfortunate incident that has compromised the integrity of his office, nor would a decision on the Treasurer's part to retain his cabinet post undermine the principle of ministerial accountability or show any disrespect of this House. I can assure the Treasurer that he has the confidence of his colleagues in this caucus and of the people of Ontario.

In the light of the incident last Thursday evening, it might be advisable for this House to take a long look at the relationship that exists between parliamentary traditions, often rooted

in the practices and conventions of a less complicated age, and the demands and procedures typical of a modern government. In particular, this incident should serve to demonstrate to all of us that we have to explore ways of opening up further the budgetary process itself. I have heard this sentiment expressed by members of all three parties, and I think that it is something we should all be working towards.

Speaking to the budget itself, it is an honest and realistic document, formulated in consultation, as has become the practice in Ontario, with a large number of groups and individuals representing a broad spectrum of Ontario society. It is an honest budget because it does not attempt to disguise the fact that, though our economy is improving, we still have some distance to go before the recovery is complete.

It is a realistic budget because it recognizes that an enduring recovery and positive economic growth can only be built on a vigorous private sector. As the Treasurer said, "Only private enterprise can undertake the investments and create jobs upon which prosperity depends." I do not say this in any dogmatic or philosophical sense. We all know, as members of the House, how much good can be done through the use of short-term job creation projects. We know what can be done by a responsible government, operating in a mixed economy, to help people through the worst days of a recessionary cycle.

At the same time, I have to believe that, in the long term, for the continuation of full-time, permanent jobs in the private economy, we have to offer incentives to business, small business and large business, and to the various organs of the economy that are going to bring about a permanent recovery in our economy.

This budget has demonstrated that our government is committed to helping the unemployed, and maintaining the level and quality of fundamental social support upon which our citizens have come to depend and which they have reason to expect in the future. The government has set out four objectives in this budget, which we believe will work towards, and help to restore, economic prosperity.

First, there is the maintenance of a co-operative federal economic system, a co-operative federal and provincial environment. Second, there is the creation of long-term private sector employment through increased productivity and through increased investment in the private sector. Third, there is the expansion of short-term job opportunities through job creation programs,

skills development and economic growth. Finally, there is the maintenance of a fiscal framework that will allow the government to fund public programs without burying the province in debt.

To achieve these objectives and to help strengthen the recovery, this budget introduces programs that will strike a balance between strategic stimulation of the economy and continued fiscal responsibility. In order to ensure the continued delivery of high-quality services to the people of Ontario and to fund job creation initiatives, the government has introduced a number of new equitable tax measures, some of which have been implemented as temporary measures. I speak specifically of the social maintenance tax, the five per cent surcharge.

As mentioned earlier, although our economy is now in a recovery mode, there remain a number of obstacles to full economic recovery. The most pressing of these, in both its economic and human consequences, is the problem of unemployment. The recession has taken a terrible toll in jobs and job opportunities across this country. In the 18-month period ending January 1983, the recession has eliminated permanently, or we hope in many cases temporarily, over 1.4 million jobs in the Canadian economy. In Ontario in 1982, employment declined by 108,000. Some improvement was evident by April of this year when seasonally adjusted employment had risen by 24,000 compared to the November 1982 low.

In spite of improvements in the Ontario economic picture in the last number of months and predictions for continued improvements during the year, unemployment will continue to be the major economic problem facing our people and facing this government. For 1983, the budget predicts an average unemployment rate of 11.7 per cent, with an average annual employment level below that of 1982. I am sure every member of this House will agree that this is a very sorry situation and one that every public organ in this country has to work towards eliminating.

This apparent paradox of high unemployment in a recovery economy can be explained by a number of factors. We have to turn here to our friends the economists. First, there is always a lag between the upturn in economic growth and activity and the decline in the rate of unemployment. In a riding like mine, which is so heavily dependent on heavy manufacturing, that is very evident. As I talk to people in my

community, they will point to the renewed activity in the housing market and increased sales of certain consumer products, but there will still inevitably be a lag before the heavy manufacturing sector pulls out of the tailspin in which it has been.

The lag will be particularly pronounced in the current recovery because the recession cut demand for products to the point where many industries were operating well below capacity. Consequently, in the initial stages of this recovery, employers will make greater use of their existing work force as they work back to full production, and they will only expand their work force when the existing people are fully employed.

The second factor is in itself paradoxical. Economic conditions improve and unemployed people, who have become so frustrated that they are no longer registered as unemployed, begin again to take up the job search and temporarily, one would expect, swell the jobless numbers. An analysis by the Toronto Dominion Bank points out that these people may well swamp the job market as they return to the employment scene, and the result will be continuing upward pressure on the unemployment rate.

It does not follow then, as some critics would have us believe, that high unemployment rates mean that recovery is an illusion. This, however, is of little immediate comfort to the unemployed man or woman. There is little comfort in being told that one is a lagging indicator. Being a lagging indicator does not buy food and it does not pay the mortgage. Nor is there comfort in being informed that one has been seasonally adjusted. We cannot seasonally adjust pain and frustration, and hardship indices cannot measure the damage done to a person's self-esteem.

It is this government's responsibility to do what it can, through both direct and indirect measures, to stimulate job creation in our economy. The programs contained in the 1983 budget prove that we have not only to accept that responsibility, but we must have the policies that will effectively discharge it. I am confident that the budget policies put before us by the Treasurer will help us to meet this challenge of unemployment without jeopardizing the fiscal integrity of this province and without burdening the citizens of Ontario with a huge public debt.

There is a connection between inflation and unemployment that must be considered when assessing the wisdom of any policy calling for

massive financial stimulation. In its latest annual report, the Bank of Canada notes that many of our current economic problems, including unemployment, are caused by the distortions in our economy introduced by inflation and stagflation in the 1970s.

8:20 p.m.

A contributing cause of this inflation was massive public spending, which, no matter how well-intentioned, produced some nasty, unintended consequences. Now, just as we are beginning to pull out of the recession, some critics would have us adopt policies that would again begin that sorry cycle. This is what they call progress, while accusing this government of being on a treadmill.

The real keys to the creation of permanent new employment lie in policies that will control the provincial deficit, that will create an environment conducive to new investment and capital formation, and that will assist our industries and manufacturers in becoming more competitive by improving their productivity.

The budget puts in place policies to stimulate the economy strategically and to help the private sector create jobs. For example, the corporate tax exemption for small businesses has been extended for a further year. We calculate this will cost the province approximately \$180 million in revenue. However, this is a sound investment in the economy that will yield a return in the form of higher tax revenues from the businesses that are able to sell their products and continue in operation.

It is also a sensible indirect investment in job creation, because historically the small business sector creates more than 50 per cent of all new jobs in this province and employs about 40 per cent of our jurisdiction's work force. In addition, small businesses will benefit, as will all businesses, from the budget's amendment of Ontario's loss carryover provision.

These changes have been introduced to complement those announced in the recent federal budget. Each of these programs and others will create in the private sector a new pool of investment capital by forgoing revenue. It is to be hoped this capital will be invested in expansion and the creation of new job opportunities. In the early stages of the recovery, it will be expected that businesses will use increased cash flow to eliminate their debts. However, this is a necessary prelude to any form of sustained growth.

We have also taken steps in this budget—and

I think this is very important—to stimulate directly the employment market by employing people through various government programs in either short term or, we hope, longer term job creation projects. Many of these projects, some of them co-operatively run by the government of Canada and the government of Ontario, were undertaken in the budget of May 1982.

In that budget, the government introduced a four-point job creation program, which included accelerating the capital projects program, the farm improvement program, the co-operative employment projects funds and youth program enrichment. These various projects received \$171 million in funding and were expected in the last year to create some 31,000 jobs. As of April, last month, the government had invested \$176 million and these programs have created more than 40,000 jobs.

I hope these efforts will be further enhanced by the Treasurer's announcement of the 90-day sales tax holiday on certain types of furniture and household goods and by the announcement of a permanent tax exemption for large trucks and trailers. This will directly benefit my riding because of the presence of Pullman Trailmobile Canada Ltd., which employs several hundred people in the production of truck trailers. I have talked to several people in the industry since the budget was brought down on Tuesday and they see great things for the trucking industry because of this measure.

In November 1982, the government provided an additional \$50 million in funds to create 7,500 new jobs through co-ordinated efforts through the Board of Industrial Leadership and Development program.

Interjection.

Mr. Gillies: Yes, the BILD program. My friends opposite are so quick to criticize it and so quick to try and take credit when it has a positive benefit in their own ridings. I always point out to my friends opposite that they are opposition members in this chamber from Monday to Friday and they are almost government members when they go back to their ridings on Saturday and Sunday, absolutely falling over themselves to announce new initiatives in their ridings and to get on the platform or in the picture with whatever minister of this government happens to be there.

But I do not want to get sidetracked by my friends opposite and talk about the habits of opposition members.

Mr. Mackenzie: I thought it was going to

spend \$150 million a year for five years. How come it is only \$111 million this year? How come the figures have changed?

The Acting Speaker: Order.

Mr. Mackenzie: It was \$150 million a year. All of a sudden it is \$111 million this year.

Mr. Gillies: I thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I thank the member for Hamilton East for the background music. He is always so helpful.

As of April 19 the total value of job creation programs under the Canada-Ontario employment development program—and this is a program that has been of distinct benefit to our community in the city of Brantford—stood at \$188.9 million. I am very pleased, as are the various municipalities in Brant county. I am sure we have benefited more, dollar for dollar, in Brant county through COED than any other jurisdiction in the province. We have already approved well over \$3 million of COED programs, which shows, I think, a great commitment on the part of the government of Ontario—

Mr. Nixon: And the government of Canada.

Mr. Gillies: —and the government of Canada, as my friend opposite reminds us, to our community.

I might say in response to those who say we need more public sector investment in our various industries that I have to be very aware that the governments of Canada and Ontario have a massive investment sitting in the Massey-Ferguson company in my riding and a very large-scale investment also in the White Farm Equipment company, not to speak of all the smaller companies that have been helped through federal programs like the industry and labour adjustment program and through provincial programs like the Ontario Development Corp. I am very sensitive to any suggestions that our governments have not taken a hands-on attitude towards the problems of our economy, because indeed they have.

I am going to speak very briefly about an area of special concern and responsibility of mine, and that is youth unemployment. We spent in the last year in this province over \$90 million on youth employment programs to create over 80,000 jobs for young people. We have to be extremely concerned that the rate of unemployment among our young people under the age of 25 is close to double that of the population as a whole. We have made a massive public sector investment through this province and through various organs of the federal govern-

ment to try to make a dent in that program.

Mr. Mackenzie: There are 220,000 unemployed young people. I thought that was your responsibility.

Mr. Gillies: Mr. Speaker, I am trying not to get sidetracked, but again I hear the very sensible and constructive suggestions being made by our friends opposite, many of whom could not even name the projects we have under way through the government now. They are not aware of the various youth employment programs that the Ontario government is running—

Interjections.

The Acting Speaker: Order.

Mr. Gillies: —and that, I would suggest, is because they are more concerned with scoring political points than they are with realistically addressing the problem.

As soon as I open my mouth on youth employment the music starts; but as soon as I start speaking about the Ontario youth employment program, the Ontario career action program, the Experience '83 program, and so on, I see nothing but blank expressions, because they do not know what I am talking about. They have no idea what our government is doing to help young people; and, at the risk of being repetitious, it is because they do not care; as long as they can score their political marks their purpose in life is achieved.

Interjections.

The Acting Speaker: Order.

Mr. Gillies: Through the budget announced by the Treasurer on Tuesday we will be enhancing these youth employment programs by some \$30 million for a total of \$120 million, an increase this year over last of over 25 per cent. I take severe exception to any suggestion that we are not doing the job, because the members of this government and the members of this caucus are responding riding by riding and they are doing the job.

8:30 p.m.

I will draw to a close with a few brief observations. This government has one of the most respected records of fiscal integrity of any jurisdiction in North America. The government of Ontario has one of the best standings in the money market. We have one of the best administrations of our own government's affairs. We have the respect of the people who are going to invest in this economy and bring our province out of the recession.

At the same time, in an ongoing fashion, we have responded with realistic and sweeping programs to help the unemployed in our society and we will continue to do so. Those efforts have been increased and enriched in this budget. We will continue to do so.

I ask the members of this House whether these things have been achieved because of the barracking of our friends across the way. I would suggest that has not done a darned thing for this province in 40-odd years. I am a very tolerant man, but like many over here I get sick of the pious prattling that we put up with day after day from the people who have never had the responsibility for so much as running a \$1-million department, a \$1-million business or anything else, when this government is stewarding over \$20 billion of the public's money every year and is doing it with the overwhelming support of the people who elected us.

It is my hope that in the weeks and months to come the Treasurer will remain in this House and retain his responsibilities as Treasurer and bring in the measures we have outlined in this budget. He will do so under the leadership of quite simply the best politician in this country, the Premier.

Mr. G. I. Miller: Why did he not go federal?

Mr. Boudria: Yes, why didn't he?

Mr. Gillies: The member would have loved that. Despite the suggestions from my friends opposite, whose Prime Minister blanched at the thought the Premier would go federal, he will continue at the helm here.

Many members of this caucus will be speaking in the days to come to the measures we have outlined in this budget. The Treasurer will bring forward the budget bills and we will march forward in a responsible manner to fulfil our obligations to the people of Ontario. It is an obligation. It is not an easy job but it is one that we take seriously and that we relish and we will continue to steward for the people of Ontario in the years to come.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to participate in the debate on the budget of earlier this week. Before speaking on the budget, I would like to remind all honourable members of the very sad economic tragedy that my own constituency is living at this very moment that we are here discussing this budget. I think it is important to talk about that in order to find out what things are like in the real world out there, not in that Utopian world that has just

been described to us by the member for Brantford (Mr. Gillies).

The constituency I live in is suffering from the highest unemployment we can ever recall, perhaps in much the same way as Brantford. Just this morning a young man came into my constituency office to ask me if I could assist him in finding a job. He has just finished his post-secondary education at Algonquin College in Ottawa where he took a course to become a machinist and tool and die maker. This is one of the professions, the line of employment, we have been telling people and informing our young people to direct their efforts towards because that is where the future is. This young person did not think the future is there.

He has been finished school for months now and cannot find any employment at all as a tool and die maker. How can we give any hope to our young people when somebody who is 23 or 24 years old and has been going to school for just about all his life cannot find any employment after taking the courses and the instruction we as a society have directed him to take?

That is the very sad reality we have in our area. When 40 per cent of our young people are unemployed, I do not think we can say things are going well and this government is doing a good job. The reality of the constituency I represent is very different.

The Minister of Industry and Trade (Mr. Walker) is here in the House with us tonight and he too knows the difficult situation my constituency is in. Perhaps I should state at this time I am grateful for the good co-operation I have personally received from the minister in trying to assist the people of the constituency of Prescott-Russell. We have had some assistance but all is not well in that area, as the minister knows. We are still hopeful we can attract more industry and more employment for the people of the riding of Prescott-Russell.

We had all hoped this budget would address itself in a major way to meaningful job creation. I am not speaking merely of the make-work things some would perhaps expect to find in the budget to create only short-term, rather meaningless jobs to get some people off one's back for a short while. That is not what I am advocating. I am stating there are many things, many capital investments that could have been made by the provincial government in the constituency I represent to stimulate employment and benefit this province on a long-term basis.

We have many public facilities in need of improvement. As the member for Carleton (Mr.

Mitchell) will know—he was here a minute ago and has now stepped out—in regard to our highways in eastern Ontario we do not even have a decent highway linking the capital of this country to Highway 401. That is a major undertaking and the kind of development project I would have liked to see included in the budget document with which we were presented earlier this week. That is the kind of initiative that would build something for the future, while at the same time giving meaningful employment to the people of this province. Sadly, we did not see those things.

We hear this is supposed to be a recovery budget, but that is contradictory. It proposes a consumer-led recovery, but it aborts the process by taking seven times more out of the consumer's pocket than it puts back in.

The members opposite and many other people have criticized the federal government in the past for its inaction, or at least what they perceive as being the federal government's inaction. The federal budget of only a few weeks ago at least delayed increases in taxes to let the economy pick itself up again, but these people have socked the consumer right away before we even had a chance to get out of the present economic recession.

Mr. Gordon: You are so naive. They are waiting for the election. You must know that. Don't they consult you? How naive.

Mr. Boudria: The member for Sudbury would know, coming from an area of high unemployment, that the people from his area are not out of the woods yet. The people from his constituency are still in a very difficult economic situation. They do not want to be socked right now with increases in taxes. They could have waited for a while for that tax increase, one that is largely due to the mismanagement of the economy by this provincial government.

I would like to refresh the members' memories about an event that took place not long ago, in February 1981. At that time the government did a few things, two of which are particularly worth remembering. One was the release of the document I have in my hand, *Building Ontario* in the 1980s, by the Board of Industrial Leadership and Development. We all remember the board, commonly known as BILD. The other major event that occurred not too many days after, by mere coincidence, was the calling of the 1981 election.

8:40 p.m.

Mr. Wildman: It was not intended that way.

Mr. Boudria: As the member for Algoma states, it was not intended that way. That is just the way things happen.

Let us remember what the government said in 1981 at that election. They wanted a mandate, they wanted to "keep the promise," they said the Premier could do it and all those other things. They wanted a mandate to keep taxes down. I am sure the House will recall that. Is that not cute?

Ontario health insurance plan premiums, which are, as members know, a form of taxation, have increased by 42 per cent in 26 months. This is not bad for a government that was going to keep taxes down. Imagine if had they not promised to keep taxes down what things would have been like.

Personal income tax has increased 15 per cent in those 26 months. Again, this is from the government that promised to keep taxes down and wanted a mandate to keep such taxes down.

Since 1981, the three budgets of the Treasurer have increased the tax burden of an average family of four with an income of \$25,000 by \$1,470.61 per year. Here is how that works: OHIP fees for the average family of four have increased by \$368.40; retail sales tax has increased for the average family by \$181; the hospitality tax, another \$159; and the usual sin taxes that people do not usually object to—but I will—liquor and tobacco, have increased by \$195.41. Apparently the government thinks it is a sin for the senior citizen to smoke his pipe and for the family to have a bottle of wine at dinner. I do not happen to agree and I do not think those taxes are any more legitimate than any of the others.

The gasoline tax has increased by \$184.13 and the provincial income tax—again the income tax of the government that promised to keep taxes down if it was re-elected—has increased by \$381.60. It is small wonder that people are losing faith in what public officials are telling them when we hear this kind of thing.

A moment ago we heard from the member for Brantford that this was an honest budget. I found that to be a particularly amusing phrase, especially when I look at page 17 of the budget document, which describes the social services maintenance tax. We should remember the previous speaker stated that this was an honest budget. Those are the words I believe he used.

A social services maintenance tax—imagine the pressure the unemployed, the welfare recipients, the recipients of family benefits, the sole-support mothers and the other people in this province who have to live on social assis-

tance are enduring at this moment. Imagine what it is like to have to exist on that amount of assistance, \$238 per month I believe it is for a single person on general welfare assistance. It is very difficult to exist and the pressures on these individuals are just unbearable.

Now, just to make them feel better, the Treasurer has a new tax called the social services maintenance tax. The person who is already paying high taxes and the welfare recipient who already feels so burdened and so pressured being on general welfare assistance are now being blamed by this government for the increase in taxes. If things are not already bad enough for people on welfare, they are going to be even worse because from now on these people are held responsible by this Treasurer for the increase in taxes.

I asked the Treasurer this afternoon if this increase in taxes will generate some \$170 million. If a \$170-million expenditure warrants a tax to be named after it—and one would assume that is the case because the Treasurer has done it—then why do we not call another tax the Minaki Lodge fiasco tax? After all, that cost us \$40 million. That certainly warrants having a tax named after it.

How about the John White land assembly vision tax? That surely deserves a name. Some \$508 million was spent on that deal by Ontario, a far greater amount than is needed this year for that increase in social assistance. Or why do we not call a new tax the Ontario Hydro overbuilding tax? Just imagine what that cost the taxpayers of Ontario. But no, the government does not name a tax that way; of course not. They would hold themselves responsible if they did. Instead, they prefer to attack the poor, the elderly and the people on social assistance.

As far as I am concerned, that is the most disgraceful thing in the whole budget. That is the thing that struck me while reading the document in the lock up session that day. Why would anyone blame the recipients of social assistance for the mismanagement of the economy this provincial government has orchestrated? That is shameful.

I would like to talk about agriculture for a moment. As the members know, the area I represent has a large farming community but, unlike other farming communities in Ontario, the farmers in my area are far from being well off. Perhaps they are not well off anywhere, but the economic situation for farmers in the area I represent is probably even worse than in most areas.

The members will recall that not long ago Highway 417 at the St. Isidore de Prescott exit in my riding was blocked by a group of disgruntled farmers, out of desperation as a method of protesting the difficult economic situation they were in, where banks were coming in daily and taking over farms.

Pork producers from our area were one day in their farms, their houses and had a business; and the next day they were on general welfare assistance with no place to stay. Overnight, just like that, everything was swept from under them. That is the harsh economic reality of the agricultural area in the riding I represent. For a long time we have stated in this House that what the provincial government has to do is put the agricultural component in a balanced situation with that of other jurisdictions.

This afternoon I asked the Treasurer why the government of this province assists farmers to an average of \$3,000 each, when the government of the nearest province to the east, Quebec, assists farmers by \$8,600-odd for every farmer. If one were a farmer in Prescott-Russell and one's farm was in St-Eugene near the Quebec border, and the farmer on the other side of the border, actually just the other side of the fence, in Quebec in St. Redempteur, Rigaud or some other area receives \$6,000 more in benefits, how is one supposed to compete when each gets the same price for his commodity? One cannot compete when one person is \$6,000 ahead of the other, no matter how one looks at it.

Mr. G. I. Miller: The member for Brantford did not mention that.

Mr. Boudria: Perhaps the member for Brantford forgot about that aspect of agriculture, or maybe he has never been to Prescott-Russell, but either way there must be farmers in his area who are just as concerned, even if they are a little farther from that artificial line that separates Ontario and Quebec.

Mr. Charlton: There is one of them sitting in the front row.

Mr. Boudria: I hope that member takes note of what I have to say. I hope the member in the front row just described previously will be able to speak on behalf of his party and explain to everyone the importance of improving the agricultural sector of this province.

8:50 p.m.

Moments ago I referred to the Board of Industrial Leadership and Development document. I am sure you have memorized the

document by now, Mr. Speaker, but I would like to refresh your memory on a few sentences which are very important for the people of the area I represent.

I am glad to see the member for Renfrew South (Mr. Yakabuski) and the member for Carleton (Mr. Mitchell) are here, because I am sure they will remember this part of the BILD document. I quote as follows:

"Through land-clearing efforts, selective drainage and farmstead improvements, one million acres of farm land in eastern and northern Ontario are capable of being upgraded into high-quality agricultural land. The large capital input required for these improvements will greatly increase the overall productive capacity of the agricultural land base and permit the expansion of high-value crops in areas where agricultural potential has not been fully realized.

"To achieve such production, Ontario will establish an acreage improvement fund which will provide financing at favourable rates."

I wonder whether members from eastern and northern Ontario recall those profound words of BILD. How did this government go about implementing this? First, it said it would drain one million acres of agricultural land. Then twice within a year after the election, the government increased the interest in the tile drainage scheme, from six per cent to eight per cent and from eight per cent to 10 per cent.

One does not have to be an economic genius to realize that if you make these plans unattractive, nobody is going to use them, and that if nobody uses them, one million acres of agricultural land will never be drained.

Further, the government was lending up to 75 per cent of the cost of improving drainage, to a maximum of \$20,000. Then they changed that and lowered it to 60 per cent.

How are farmers in eastern and northern Ontario ever going to drain that one million acres which the government itself thinks is a reasonable amount of land to drain in those areas when the government is making plans unattractive for the people of eastern and northern Ontario?

One might think the people of eastern and northern Ontario could have drained their farms at the same time as the people of southwestern Ontario did. But that is not so. Let me tell the members why. It is important to realize that up until a few years ago, the tiles that were used to improve drainage were orange clay tiles. Those orange clay tiles did not work in our area; they broke under the weight of the clay and the

farmers in our area therefore were not able to drain with those tiles.

The member for Renfrew South knows those things did not work in our area.

Mr. Pollock: I am not from Renfrew South. I am from Hastings-Peterborough.

Mr. Boudria: I am sorry; Hastings-Peterborough. He should know that; he is from eastern Ontario as well.

We know that when they started with the perforated tiles, these tiles worked fine in our area. But by the time we got those tiles, by the time technology was able to accommodate us, the government programs no longer were attractive.

Why are the government programs not attractive for eastern and northern Ontario when they were attractive elsewhere? Can the government answer that question?

Would it not be logical to have programs now that would be as meaningful as the programs were when other parts of the province were drained? I ask the member for Hastings-Peterborough, does eastern Ontario deserve no less?

Those things have to be addressed. Improvements in the agricultural area are very important, especially in tile drainage. That is the only way the yield will be improved in eastern and northern Ontario so that we can begin to compete not only with the other parts of Ontario that have already been tile-drained but also with those other provinces that are getting far greater benefits than we are in this province. That is going to have to be addressed very soon by this government, but we are very sorry to hear the budget does not address this issue at all.

The government talks about the \$135-million young farmer program. Of course, those are empty words, because \$9 million is going to be spent this year and that is all. Just the interest on the Suncor purchase is going to be \$93 million this year. The interest on 25 per cent of an oil company that produced only one job in this province is \$93 million and the help to young farmers is \$9 million. All the young farmers together are worth only 10 per cent of the effort that the Premier (Mr. Davis) put into purchasing Suncor, or one quarter of Suncor, in order to have "a window on the oil industry," whatever that means.

Mr. G. I. Miller: Agriculture is not playing a big role.

Mr. Boudria: We can see, as the member for Haldimand-Norfolk states, that agriculture is

not playing a very big role in this province. The government extracts more from the agricultural area than it puts back in.

Let me give an example of this. The government's commitment to the whole agriculture sector in the province is \$295 million. Do members know how much tax is generated just from tobacco, which is, of course, an agricultural product? The member for Haldimand-Norfolk would know. It was \$533 million that was collected in tobacco taxes. Not only is the government not giving anything to the agriculture sector, it is taking it away from the agriculture sector.

Mr. Ruston: They are bleeding it.

Mr. Boudria: As the member for Essex North says, the government is bleeding the agriculture area. That is its effort in the agriculture sector.

Mr. Ruston: Plus all the tax they get on the corn and the booze.

Mr. Rotenberg: We are taking it from smokers, not the farmers, and you know that.

Mr. Boudria: The member for the large agricultural area of Wilson Heights, with all the farms that are there and all the acreage that is in agricultural production in that constituency, would know that whether we are taxing one part or the other it is still a farm product, as the member for Essex North has stated.

I would like to comment very briefly on the youth employment programs of this government.

Mr. Wildman: Where is the member for Brantford?

Mr. Boudria: I would have liked the member for Brantford to be here in his capacity as the parliamentary assistant to the Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Mrs. Birch).

Mr. Ruston: Whatever that means.

Mr. Boudria: Yes, whatever all that means. I guess it means he is responsible for the youth employment or, as some of us would like to say, the youth unemployment in this province.

Mr. Charlton: You mean he is responsible for this mess we have got?

Mr. Boudria: He takes credit for things being fine, so I guess he has to share in the blame for things not working. One should follow with the other. Therefore, if he takes the credit for things being good, I believe he should take part of the blame for things being bad.

Youth unemployment across the province, as we have been saying, is approximately 22 per cent and will rise over the summer months. One out of every four young people in this province

will be out of a job this summer, and that is a very sad state of affairs. That is not the kind of treatment we had when we were seeking employment as young people—not that I consider myself that old, but I am still past the age after which one is usually described as qualifying for inclusion in the youth statistics.

The member for Brantford was explaining all the virtues of some of the programs his government has put in place, programs that he says are really helping out the youth of our province. I think the youth programs in this province are an unmitigated disaster.

We have talked about the Ontario youth employment program before, which had, by the way, \$6.5 million left over in its kitty last year. Can you imagine having money left in a youth employment program, Mr. Speaker? That is how well they have administered it; they had money left. I am sure the young people of this province who stayed unemployed last year are not impressed by having money left in the program. It is another example of the maladministration of this province by this government.

9 p.m.

The Ontario youth employment program was not the only failure. The youth programs last year were supposed to create 93,000 jobs, we were told. But all the information we have to date tells us that only 75,000 positions were achieved. It is ludicrous that in a year when youth employment soared to unprecedented heights, the government fell 18,000 jobs or 20 per cent short of its already inadequate goal.

I was on an open-line radio show the other day with the member for Brantford, and we were discussing youth unemployment. The thing I fail to understand is why it is, if the government programs are so great, we have one quarter of all our young people out of work. If the government is doing such a fine job, why is it that instead of spending some \$70 per unemployed youth, as it was three years ago, it is today spending \$46? That is not improvement, not matter how one cuts it.

If the government is spending \$46 per unemployed youth and it was spending \$70 only a few years ago, I think this speaks very sadly to the record of this government in improving the lives of our young people. The young people of this province have been let down by the government.

Last year, along with the member for Essex South (Mr. Mancini) and the member for Kitchener-Wilmot (Mr. Sweeney), I was on a youth employment task force we sent around this province. We spoke to many unemployed

youth in this province, and they were not impressed with the record of this government.

Mr. Rotenberg: I am sure they were impressed with you.

Mr. Boudria: I want the member for Wilson Heights to know that when we interviewed the youth of this province, we asked them, "If you had known what it was like, would you have quit school?" In all cases the young people answered, "No, I would not have."

Do members know what that tells us? That tells all of us—and the member for Wilson Heights as well—that we are misleading our young people as a society.

Mr. Rotenberg: Maybe you are.

Mr. Boudria: I think all of us are collectively responsible for this. When we do not provide adequate guidance for our young people, when the average young person goes out of high school having received something like four minutes of guidance, does the member not agree we are collectively misleading those young people? When most of the information they get is from watching television versus getting adequate guidance in school, does the member feel we are not misleading our young people? I do not believe that. I think that we are, as a society, if we have nothing better to tell them.

When one goes into a high school and speaks with students, as I have done on many cases—and I am sure the member for Wilson Heights has—and asks them, "What do you want to do?" and one still hears such occupations as hair-dresser, auto mechanic, airline pilot and cruise stewardesses, we as a society are not telling them everything that has to be said.

When one asks a young person who says he wants to be an airline pilot, "Do you know whether there are any openings for that?" the young person says: "Well, gee, no. I never did think of it that way." Why not?

Is it because instead of having one guidance teacher for every 300 young people, as the professionals state we should have, or one guidance teacher to every 350, as the Minister of Education (Miss Stephenson) says we should have, we are not meeting any of those objectives because we have one guidance teacher for every 410 young people in this province, most guidance teachers being busy filling out forms and doing crisis counselling and all those other kinds of things they have to do and not having any time for career counselling of our young people?

I tell the member for Wilson Heights that yes, as a society, we are misleading our young people

if we cannot tell them anything better than what we have done now.

I challenge members to do the same as we have done in our task force to go to schools, go to drop-in centres, go to where the young people are and talk to them individually; to take the few days it takes to do it and go all across the province.

We went to Ottawa, Toronto, Windsor, Thunder Bay, Sudbury and various other areas, and it is the same everywhere. The numbers change but the feeling does not that we, as a society, have not told them what we should have. We have not informed them. We have let them down. This budget and the attitudes of this government towards young people are not making it any better, and that is a very sad reality.

I have just been looking at a newspaper clipping from today's Toronto Star. We have Archbishop Remi De Roo telling us that the government of this province—all governments for that matter—has a wrong set of values: "profits and growth instead of compassionate concern for the weak and the poor." I would add to that the young, because if we are letting down any group in our society, the young have to be included with the weak and the poor.

If there is one good thing that has come out of this budget it is the change of heart that this government finally has had towards the child-rearing drop-out provision. If there is any one member of this Legislature who deserves credit for having that changed because of all his personal effort in that area, it is the member for London Centre (Mr. Peterson), the Leader of the Opposition.

The Leader of the Opposition has been pressing the government on this issue for two or three years now, I guess. Ever since I have been in this Legislature, the member for London Centre has been speaking of the child-rearing drop-out provision and the unreasonable attitude of the Treasurer and the government towards changing that veto and allowing—

Mr. Cassidy: The NDP was making that argument five years before the member for London Centre became leader.

Mr. Boudria: I am not here to argue who said it first. All I know is that I have been a member of this House for a little more than two years and I have not heard an NDP member raise that issue. Maybe they have, but not while I was here. The member for London Centre has raised it, and he still has a resolution on the order paper right now concerning the topic. He has put a lot of effort into that area and he has

succeeded in convincing the government finally to do something about it.

This province was the last holdout on dropping the veto. In March 1981, British Columbia finally got around to changing its mind and allowing the child-rearing drop-out provision. But this province, because it has more than a third of the population of the nine provinces participating in the Canada pension plan, had an effective veto since two-thirds consent is necessary to make any change in the Canada pension plan.

This government, by being the last holdout, prevented the enhancement of life of women not only in Ontario but all across this country. Maybe the Premier should have thought about that issue as well before thinking of running for the federal leadership. More than half the population of this country are women, and this particular feature of the Canada pension plan was especially unfair to them. Now it will finally be corrected, and it is not a moment too soon.

If the government attempts to take any credit for having done this, credit is not in order. They were forced to do it. They saw the pressure that was on them. They saw the pressure that other political parties, lobby groups and all other provinces exerted to get them to move.

I have my own theory as to why the government did not move any earlier. This government was holding out on any changes to the Canada pension plan, because it wanted an increase in CPP rates. Why did it want an increase in CPP rates? Because the plan was running dry. Why was it running dry? This government has squandered the money on other things; that is why the plan was running dry.

The government was holding the women of this country hostage to try to get bigger premiums, but it failed and now it has finally dropped that. It is about time the government dropped that ridiculous idea. I am glad the women of this province, and of the whole country for that matter, for the reasons I have previously outlined, finally will be getting an improvement in the Canada pension plan.

Mr. Rotenberg: You're getting your speech material from Grimm's Fairy Tales.

9:10 p.m.

Mr. Boudria: I hope the member for Wilson Heights makes his contribution to the budget debate immediately. I am sure he will have much constructive criticism to offer, and I hope he also indicates to the Treasurer that several things in the budget need to be improved.

It is quite evident to all of us looking at this document that it is a hastily prepared document. That is not only because of the type of paper it is printed on; its contents seem to indicate to us that perhaps it was something that was rushed through in three or four days just to have something to say. But it is not good enough for the people of Prescott-Russell, and it is not good enough for the people of Ontario.

This document, along with the accompanying throne speech, indicates to us that this government cannot keep the promise and that Davis cannot do it, and the sooner we get rid of the government, the better.

Mr. Wildman: Mr. Speaker, as I proceed to participate in this budget debate, I would like to extend my congratulations to you on your success in presiding over this Legislature and to your colleagues who also share the duties in the chair.

As you know, this is the first opportunity I have had to participate at any length in a debate, because I had an unfortunate accident during the winter and have not been in this House as much as other members and as much as I would have liked to have been.

I want to raise with you, Mr. Speaker, and with members of the Legislature a number of concerns that relate to the budget and how it relates to my area. As I said, I have not had the opportunity to participate in many debates recently, and I hope to be able to raise a number of issues that are of concern in my riding and northern Ontario, as well as the whole province, that I have been concerned about and have not been able to express in this forum.

I do regret, though, as I glance across the way, that there is not anyone from the government present. I wonder why the government is not represented in this debate on the budget. There is not one member of the executive council in this chamber. I think that is unfortunate. I suppose it indicates how much of an interest they have in the budget and in the economic affairs of this province and specifically in what the members of the Legislature, whether they be from the New Democratic Party, the Liberal Party or the Conservative back benches, have to say about the economy and the economic affairs of this province. It is most unfortunate, and I hope the chief government whip is able to find where the government has disappeared to.

I note the member for Oxford (Mr. Treleaven) is waving at me. I do hope his aspirations are some day answered, but I have to remind him that at this time he is not a member of the

government. He is a member of the party that supports the government but he is not a member of the government.

I notice one of the executive council members now has returned, and I welcome him to the debate.

As we proceed with this budget debate, we are experiencing a crisis in the affairs of this province. As has been noted many times during this debate, we are facing the highest unemployment rates Ontario has seen since the great Depression. In the past year, Ontario has lost 221,000 jobs. I come from an area of the province that is experiencing one of the highest unemployment rates in the country. Sault Ste. Marie and Algoma are experiencing unemployment rates in the neighbourhood of 30 to 35 per cent.

It took a little longer for the unemployment figures to reach these terrible heights in our area than it did in some other areas of the province, mainly because the steel industry in this country and this province has traditionally been somewhat shielded from the cyclical ups and downs of manufacturing in this country. I suppose this is partly because it is mainly Canadian-owned. It has tended to try to keep up with the technical advances in the industry and, as a result, has been able to deal with the changes in the market system better than many of the other manufacturing and primary resource industries in Ontario.

But obviously, if we have a downturn in the auto industry, in appliance manufacturing and in the other manufacturing sectors of southern Ontario, it eventually had to get back to the steel industry. So it did. When it hit, it hit very hard. In Sault Ste. Marie and Algoma now we are experiencing unemployment that has not been seen in that area since 1954. We have a whole generation of workers who have never experienced this kind of situation.

We have people who at this moment are exhausting unemployment insurance after having been laid off for a year or over a year—people who in many cases have never been on unemployment insurance in their lives—and now are having to switch to welfare and are getting the shock of their lives to find that their welfare benefits are about half of what they got on unemployment insurance. It is a very serious situation.

When we hear Liberal and Conservative politicians in this country going around talking about recovery, it has a very hollow ring for those people who are exhausting their unemployment insurance benefits and who have been

told by the president of the Algoma Steel Corp. that even when that major company in this province, the main employer in my area, gets back to full production, when it starts utilizing its full capacity, there will be at least 1,500 fewer jobs at Algoma Steel than there were when the layoffs started.

Most of those people who are not going to go back to work are people with up to three or five years' seniority, depending on which department they come from at the Algoma Steel plant. We are talking mainly about young people, a large proportion of whom have trades—skills they now cannot market in the job market in their area because there is not any other employer.

The member for Hamilton East (Mr. MacKenzie) and others from his area have described the problems facing that community, which is dependent on steel, and he has talked about a lot of the smaller plant shutdowns in his area. I would like to point out that in Sault Ste. Marie we do not have any small plants. We never did. Although we have one of the three major steel plants in this country, we have almost no secondary manufacturing and no steel fabrication in our community. There are not any other jobs.

The other jobs in our area are primary resource jobs, mainly in the forestry industry. Then as we get up into Wawa, we are talking about mining and those other areas. Of course, the mining in Wawa is dependent on Algoma Steel. We do have some hope that there will be some expansion of the gold mining in the northern part of my riding. I suppose the tax concessions for the gold Maple Leaf will somehow help the Hemlo operation, but they will not mean a lot in terms of employment in the foreseeable future.

9:20 p.m.

I want to talk generally about the unemployment situation we face in our area and across this province and what I believe the Treasurer should have been doing to respond in the short term. Other members will discuss the long term, and I will refer to it briefly, but my main concern is the crisis we are experiencing in our area right now.

What hope can we give to these people who are facing a tremendous loss of income? It is not just a loss of income, but a loss of the sense of self-worth and a loss of dignity which we cannot put back very easily. I am not trying to overdramatize this situation.

I come to Toronto every week. I travel through southern Ontario and I know that

people have experienced major shutdowns and layoffs, but in a large metropolitan community like this the situation, serious as it is, tends to be masked. There is still construction going on in downtown Toronto; there are still jobs, even though a large number of construction workers are out of work. There are people working and there still seems to be development.

However, in our part of the province there is absolutely nothing. If a person is on unemployment insurance and he is supposed to be doing a job search, the Canada Employment and Immigration Commission just tells him to forget it; officers know it is no use going to look for work. He becomes a nuisance to the small businesses that are still in operation, because they do not have any jobs to provide. He is going there over and over again and being a nuisance; so the commission is not even asking for job searches any more.

As I understand it, the welfare department used to ask for 20 job searches a week in good times; now they ask for five. They are still asking for them but they are only asking for five, that is how serious it is. There is just nothing else.

When we talk about the budget projection of an 11.7 per cent unemployment rate for 1983 and realize that is a growth of about two per cent in unemployment from 1982, that is serious enough. It is an indication of the failure of the government to respond to the need to develop employment in this province, but it looks good to someone from Algoma. If we could return to the time when we had 11.7 per cent unemployment, things would look pretty good in our area. When one is experiencing 30 to 35 per cent joblessness, that does not look too bad.

However, I do not suppose that is something the Treasurer should feel good about when and if he ever returns to this debate. Obviously that 11.7 per cent jobless rate he is projecting for this year includes areas like my own which has such a high unemployment rate and that is contributing to it.

When we look at the projection of an average unemployment rate of 535,000 people, we all realize that is the official unemployment rate. The member for Brantford (Mr. Gillies) referred to the fact that there are many other people out of work who have given up and are not looking for jobs. They are not in the job market. They are not eligible for unemployment insurance any more and they are just not counted in the figures.

He tried to argue that if these people come

back into the job market and start looking for work because they think there might be new opportunities, in some way they are then increasing unemployment; but they are not increasing unemployment, they are already out of work.

Mr. Boudria: They are increasing statistics.

Mr. Wildman: They are increasing statistics or official unemployment.

We know that as a result of this budget in this province we will have real unemployment in Ontario of about 786,000 people in 1983. We know from the Treasurer's own figures that there will be 93,000 more jobless people in this province this year than there were last year because of the increase in the work force. The Treasurer's own figures project a loss of 37,000 more jobs this year than we had last year. If this is a recovery budget, I would hate to see a recession.

The Treasurer argues that this is a job creation budget and he has introduced a number of measures to try to produce more employment. Some of those things can be welcomed. Certainly the accelerated capital works program is better than nothing. The Treasurer is projecting \$246 million in accelerated capital works which will produce 12,000 jobs this year. It is interesting, though, when we look at those figures we understand the job projection for this year of 12,000 is less than the jobs projected from capital works last year. As I said, it is better than nothing.

One of those capital works projects, according to the member for Sault Ste. Marie, the Minister of Labour (Mr. Ramsay), is the long-awaited renovation and expansion of the Sault Ste. Marie Jail. I understand something like \$1.6 million will be expended to try to deal with the problems they have been experiencing at the jail for some time. As the members may know, this goes back to 1978 and the by-election in Sault Ste. Marie when the provincial government promised it was going to build a new jail. At least it said it was going to do something about the old jail and everyone understood it was going to build a new one.

Since that time we have had a long series of reports from the public institutions inspection panels, which have said that the jail is overcrowded and is a fire trap and that the section for male prisoners at the jail, which was built to accommodate 38 prisoners, on occasion has between 60 and 70 prisoners located there.

It is interesting that the public institutions inspection panels have indicated there should be a new jail constructed and have criticized the

Minister of Correctional Services (Mr. Leluk) for failing to respond to their repeated requests that he provide the funding for a new jail for our area.

One panel described the Sault jail in November 1982 as "outdated, antiquated and in need of space in all areas." It said, "The jail is periodically overcrowded, a fire trap, poorly lighted and poorly ventilated". It said it needed immediately "a new fire and emergency alarm system to be installed."

I can only say we have been very fortunate there has not been a major emergency, especially during one of the periods when the jail is overcrowded, which would have required an early warning and evacuation of inmates and staff, especially from the third-floor area which houses the prisoners who need less security, since there is no adequate fire escape from that area of the jail.

Apparently we are going to get some kind of expansion and renovation of the jail. I welcome that, but I regret we are not going to get what is obviously required and has been requested by the public institutions inspection panels: a new jail. I wonder why we are not going to get a new jail. I wonder what keeping the promise means in regard to the comments about a new facility made at the time of the by-election.

I recognize the project will produce some short-term jobs and it will alleviate the situation experienced at that facility for so long, but I can only say it is about time. I regret we are apparently not getting what is really required.

9:30 p.m.

In the budget, the Treasurer made a great to-do about the short-term jobs he was producing to deal with the short-term economic situation we face and to help the recovery get started; the recovery he seems to see but that most of us find rather elusive.

He said these accelerated capital works would produce 12,000 jobs, but when one starts looking at equivalents in terms of full-time employment and determines what that means in relation to full-year employment, we find these works will provide only about 2,400 new jobs.

The Treasurer also pointed to the Canada-Ontario employment development program, which is administered by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Ramsay), and argued there were going to be 19,000 short-term jobs created through COED projects across the province. That is infinitesimal when one realizes that 17,000 unemployed workers across Ontario exhaust their unemployment insurance benefits every month, and

that COED is mainly set up to assist the "exhaustees," as they are called, to get short-term employment so they can then requalify for unemployment insurance benefits.

So we have 19,000 short-term jobs when we have almost that same number exhausting their unemployment insurance benefits each month in Ontario. How anyone can crow about that kind of program to help exhaustees is beyond me. I find it rather interesting when I look at what this means in terms of full-time employment or full-year jobs. Instead of 19,000, it really means 8,403 jobs across Ontario; I am talking about the equivalent in full-time employment. I am even more disappointed when I realize these jobs are not new jobs, they are jobs that were already announced in November 1982 when the COED program was announced here and in Ottawa.

It appears that in this particular program the Treasurer is trying to parade an old program, one that is already committed, as a new one that is going to produce new employment. He is trying to make jobs that have already been committed look as if they are part of the job creation program resulting from this budget, and it is just not true. When you consider that this COED program will provide the equivalent of 8,400 full-time jobs across Ontario and realize there are over 14,000 people out of work in Sault Ste. Marie and Algoma out of a total work force of somewhere between 35,000 and 40,000, you can see how inadequate that kind of program is.

As I said before, the statements made by Liberal and Conservative politicians to the effect that the economy has begun to recover, that we are at the beginning of a recovery, are really of little comfort to the people who are exhausting their unemployment insurance benefits after having been laid off for a full year. They are now facing having to live on welfare benefits and losing their homes, because that is what is happening to most of them. When one is having to plead with his bank manager to adjust his payment plan for his mortgage so he does not lose his home, it is pretty cold comfort to hear Marc Lalonde or the Treasurer say we are in a recovery and things are turning around and improving.

If one considers the equivalent new jobs—full-time, full-year jobs—that are resulting from the short-term job creation programs announced in this budget, and subtracts from them the COED program which was already announced, one finds the government programs announced in the budget will create 20,783 new jobs. When

one considers that we have a real unemployment rate of about 780,000, how this government can talk about a job creation budget is beyond me. At best, these short-term job creation programs will help about 3.7 per cent of the currently unemployed in this province.

We in the New Democratic Party believe it is the right of every Ontarian who wishes to work to have a job. We believe he should have the opportunity to improve himself or herself and that he should have the opportunity to gain the sense of self-worth and dignity that comes with working and improving one's lot in life.

Employment is the only valid definition of a healthy economy. Job creation, in my view, is the only valid definition of an economic recovery. It is not enough to measure so-called economic recovery, as the Treasurer appears to do, and his government along with him, on the basis of profit ledgers. The Treasurer seems to have bought the Reaganite argument that if the profit picture for the major corporations improves, it will somehow trickle down through the economy, lead to expansion and provide jobs.

Considering the debt load that many corporations have been carrying through this recent period of high interest rates, as they get more fiscal room to manoeuvre, most of those corporations are going to take the opportunity to cut their debt loads; they are not going to expand their operations and hire more workers or call back laid-off employees until there is a market for their products. It does not make sense to say that just because the major corporations are facing a better picture financially we are in an economic recovery, when unemployment is increasing.

The Treasurer alluded to this somewhat when he said he hoped for a consumer-led recovery; that what was needed in this province was for the consumers to free up some money and start spending so there would be a market and business would be able to expand. It may sound funny that I would be agreeing with this, but I do agree with it: in the short term we do need to increase consumer spending.

In Canada and in Ontario we have had too much saving. People in this economic situation are very insecure. Those who still have jobs do not know whether they are going to continue to have those jobs, so they are not going to make major purchases, they are not going to commit themselves to long-term expenditures and they certainly are not going to borrow heavily at a bank to buy automobiles, furniture, appliances—the kinds of purchases that must be made in

order to stimulate economic growth in the short term. So we need to encourage consumer spending to create jobs; we have to create the market.

In our view, though, the government has to act to put people back to work so they have some money coming in, they have money in their pockets, they have some encouragement and some hope for the future and they have some security, so they will make the purchases that are required to expand the market for manufactured goods in Ontario and in Canada.

9:40 p.m.

The Treasurer had one major proposal for trying to encourage consumer spending, and that was the 90-day sales tax holiday, which would save the consumers of this province approximately \$55 million. That kind of approach raises a lot of questions. The Treasurer has done it before. He has done it with automobiles in the short term. These are questions the Treasurer himself has addressed on other occasions. He pointed out at one point that a short-term sales tax holiday really moves purchases around, it does not increase them.

If I am intending to purchase a living-room suite some time in the next few months, obviously I am going to purchase it during the 90-day period, if I can, when the sales tax is no longer in effect. But if I already have a living-room suite and do not need one, I am not going to rush out and purchase one just because the sales tax is off for 90 days.

In my view what that sales tax holiday is going to do is assist retail store owners to move inventory more quickly, and that is a useful effect. It will help the retail merchant to move inventory. But will that retail store owner then replace the inventory? Will he order more living-room suites from the furniture manufacturer? I submit that most of the retail merchants will not order as many living-room suites as they have in the past because of the difficult time they have experienced in carrying inventory, especially with the recent high interest rates.

While this short-term stimulus will help the retail merchants, I very much doubt it will produce the kind of stimulus to the manufacturing sector that will mean laid-off workers will be called back, plants will reopen, unused capacity will be utilized and that will get the economy going again; I very much doubt it.

When one looks at the figures projected in the budget, one realizes that what we are talking about is a growth in retail sales of only one per cent in real terms. A growth of only one per cent

in real terms is not going to put all those laid-off workers back to work. It will help the retail stores, and that is good, but it is not going to do what the Treasurer would like us to believe it will do.

Mr. J. M. Johnson: Why not give them 60 to 90 days to find out?

Mr. Wildman: I do not debate that; I agreed with that. I said there was going to be an increase in the number of sales of furniture and appliances. That is going to happen, that is the idea.

The member for Wellington-Dufferin-Peel (Mr. J. M. Johnson) is saying the Treasurer intends this program only to help the retail sector. He does not really expect it is going to help the manufacturing sector. If that is what he is saying, then we are in agreement.

Mr. J. M. Johnson: That is not what he said.

Mr. Wildman: I submit the retail owners in Sault Ste. Marie are not going to reorder when there is 30 per cent unemployment in Sault Ste. Marie. They are going to reorder when the steel plant gets the majority of people back to work in Sault Ste. Marie. Then they are going to reorder. This sales tax holiday is not going to produce a rehiring of the laid-off employees at Algoma Steel.

Mr. J. M. Johnson: Talk about all of Ontario, not one area.

Mr. Wildman: All right: Hamilton, Windsor, whatever area one likes.

The problem with this budget is that it does not do what we believe is necessary in order to have a consumer-led recovery, and that is putting people back to work and earning incomes they can spend.

We have talked this evening about youth unemployment. This budget suggests a great deal of short-term jobs for the youth. The member for Brantford (Mr. Gillies) talked at length about what was going to improve the situation with youth unemployment in this province. He accused the opposition of not knowing or caring about what the government is doing in that area. Yet he could not react to the fact there are going to be 220,000 young people out of work in Ontario.

If the government is doing such a good job in that area, why are there that many people out of work? Why do we have 22 per cent unemployment between the ages of 15 and 25 in this province?

We on this side of the House are accused sometimes of being gloom and doom boys. That is the term the government likes to use. In my view, we often have on the other side of the House a bunch of Pollyannas who believe: "Say everything is wonderful. Do not look at the hard realities. Just wish things were better, and they will be."

I do not think that either the gloom and doom or the Pollyanna approach is going to help anyone in this province. I think we have to talk about what the real situation is, good or bad, and unfortunately in this particular economic period it is more bad than it is good.

Our party proposed a lot of job creation programs we believe this government could have instituted. We have suggested that in the short term there should be summer employment programs for the youth at a cost of about \$81 million, which could have produced 89,000 seasonal jobs.

We have not just decided to have short-term make-work projects that do not mean anything, but job creation projects that would respond to the needs of various sectors of the economy in this province while at the same time giving jobs to young people, getting them involved in the work force, and letting them gain skills they will be able to use later when they finish school and enter the permanent work force.

One of the areas we suggested was forest conservation. We have suggested the government could form teams of young people who would be assigned to each Ministry of Natural Resources district, who then could get involved in things such as forest rehabilitation and reforestation. We have suggested allocating \$20 million to that program. Over a period of time, it would produce about 14,000 jobs.

This is responding to a serious need, which is of tremendous importance not only to the northern part of the province, to my area, but to the whole economy of Ontario. I think many people in southern Ontario do not realize that forestry and the industries related to forestry are the largest employer in Ontario, and in Canada for that matter.

We have experienced a situation over a period of time where the industry has mined what should be a renewable resource. I know my colleague the member for Lake Nipigon (Mr. Stokes) and other northern members have raised this issue over and over again in this House. We have seen the situation where we have cut far more than we have regenerated. We are in the unbelievable and undesirable

situation in this province of facing a shortage of timber within the next 10 years, a renewable resource we should never run out of and that we should farm, yet we are running short of it.

9:50 p.m.

We believe one of the ways of providing jobs is to respond to the real need to increase forest rehabilitation in Ontario. Frankly, we would like to have never reached this situation. We feel the government has failed, as has the industry failed, to respond to this major need of the province. But, since we are now facing this situation, I do not think it does anybody any good just to cry over the situation we have had in the past. We should be doing something about it and what better opportunity than a period of high unemployment when we could be employing people in a useful task like forest rehabilitation.

There have been a number of other short-term work creation projects that we have proposed that would respond to the needs of not only my area but the whole province. One of the problems that we have in northern Ontario, of course, is distance from one community to another. We find that even in areas—Algoma district, for instance—where a particular service is provided, and in northern Ontario we often have fewer services than are taken for granted in the southern part of the province, in many cases the distances between communities make it impossible for people in need of that service to benefit from it, unless they move and leave their family and friends or commute back and forth at great distances.

For my area, ever since I came to this House, I have been raising issues about the need to provide services to the elderly and to the disabled in their own community so they do not have to leave their communities to travel hundreds of miles to the nearest large centre where those services might be provided. In our proposal for work creation, we suggested a homemaker service that could employ 1,000 people at a cost of about \$8 million.

This really relates specifically to a need in my riding since we have a situation where the homemaker services are not provided beyond three communities in Algoma district. They are provided in Sault Ste. Marie but the homemaker service goes only 20 miles outside the city limits and if you live even one mile farther you cannot receive it.

In 1980, as a matter of fact, I presented a

petition on behalf of the residents of the community of Goulais River, which is just beyond 20 miles outside Sault Ste. Marie, requesting that there be changes made in the home health care program so that an aged or a physically handicapped adult who did not necessarily require medical services, such as nursing or physiotherapy, but was unable to care for himself or herself at home, could get homemaker services in their own communities.

Because of the lack of these services, in many cases these kinds of people have had to have institutional care which they did not really require, and because they needed help they have had to remain in institutions far longer than they should have.

In response, after two years the Minister of Health (Mr. Grossman) eventually did change the program. He brought in six pilot projects across the province for an expanded homemaker service. Ironically, after presenting this petition in this Legislature, one of the areas accepted for the six projects was not Goulais River, not even Algoma district.

I do not really think that had anything to do with partisan politics, I am sure it did not; I welcomed the institution of the pilot projects, hoping this would lead to an expansion of the homemaker service into other areas such as my own. Unfortunately that did not happen. I think one of the more positive proposals made by this caucus in this job creation program was the proposal for a homemaker service that could provide care for people in their own homes, enabling them to stay with family and friends, feel more independent and yet get the kind of care they need, and avoid having them stay in institutional care at a far greater cost and longer than was required.

These are short-term suggestions, but obviously there is a tremendous need for youth training, especially if one considers that in my area 1,500 young people are not going to get back to work when Algoma Steel is in full production. If there are going to be jobs in the 1980s, we have to train the youth for them.

I recognize that in this budget the Treasurer did talk about the institution of training programs for young people, and I welcome that. I look forward to hearing about the changes and proposals that are going to be made by the Minister of Colleges and Universities (Miss Stephenson) in that regard. I understand Sault Ste. Marie is one of three areas that is specifically singled out to benefit from this, so I suppose

this means that Sault College is going to get some courses that are required to train the young people of our area.

One of the problems we have now is that if an individual is on unemployment insurance and would qualify according to the manpower regulations of the federal government for a training course that would upgrade his skills so he might be able to take a job when and if jobs become available, he finds that those courses are not provided at Sault College; they just do not have the courses. We have had situations where people have had to go to Kapuskasing, Sudbury, Thunder Bay, Timmins or southern Ontario, in some cases, to take courses.

Mr. Speaker, tell me how an individual who is on unemployment insurance, who has had a major drop in his income, is going to finance travelling hundreds of miles away and living in residence in order to take a course. It just does not work, so most of those people are not taking these courses and are not benefiting from the few that are available.

I hope this program will provide some of the needed courses that will identify the skills that are going to be required in the future, so that people in our area will be able to take these courses while they are on unemployment insurance and thus will be trained when jobs become available.

In that regard I also want to point out one other thing. If an individual who is laid off and on unemployment insurance, or who has exhausted his unemployment insurance and is on welfare, decides he or she wants to take an upgrading course, wants to return to school to take a course that would provide him with some skills that make it possible for him to get back into the employment market, he finds there are impediments in the regulations if that particular course is not recommended to him by Canada Manpower.

I will give an example. If you have a married couple, both of whom are out of work and where the breadwinner, so called, would qualify for welfare benefits, so called, if one of them returns to school to take a course, both of them cannot get welfare unless that course is recommended by Canada Manpower or the welfare department. Under section 6(2) of regulation 441 under the General Welfare Assistance Act, "An unemployable person who is enrolled as a full-time student at an educational institution is

not eligible for general assistance."

What we are saying as a society is that we would rather have people sit at home, do nothing and collect welfare benefits than get out and train themselves to qualify for jobs. I just do not understand this, especially when you consider that we supposedly have a small-c conservative government here that believes in the value of work and believes in individual initiatives, getting out and improving oneself.

Why is this government setting up a regulation that says to people, "We do not want you to improve yourselves; we want you to sit home and waste your time so you can get welfare benefits." I just do not understand it.

10 p.m.

Not only is an individual who returns to work ineligible for welfare assistance himself, but, as I said, so is a married couple. According to section 3(c) of regulation 441, "A welfare administrator must be satisfied that both husband and wife are available for and willing to take employment in order for the couple to be eligible for welfare benefits."

I have a situation in my area, in the city of Sault Ste. Marie, where a young woman who was laid off a year ago at Algoma Steel along with her husband decided: "I do not want to just sit around. I am going back to university. I am going to Lake Superior State College in Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan, to study nursing so I can get a job at the hospital after I complete my course."

She went without her unemployment insurance benefits because, going back to school, she was not available for employment so she was not eligible for unemployment insurance. Her husband collected unemployment insurance for a year. When his unemployment insurance benefits ran out, he went to the welfare department to apply for welfare and was told, "Sorry, you do not qualify for welfare because your wife is going to school" — not because "you are going to school" but because "your wife is going to school."

When I asked the welfare administrator what on earth he was doing, he said: "It is not us. It is the provincial regulations."

Mr. Allen: The same is true for dependent family benefits kids who want to go to university.

Mr. Wildman: That is right. If this government is serious about youth training and upgrading

the skills of young people, I urge it to introduce the legislative and regulatory changes needed to enable employable welfare recipients who have no other means of support to continue receiving income assistance while they are enrolled in full-time education courses.

It does not make sense to me that during a recession, with the high unemployment rates being experienced by so many communities across Ontario, the provincial government would not be encouraging laid-off workers and their spouses to upgrade their skills and knowledge. It is about time we stopped penalizing people for returning to school. If we do change the regulations, perhaps these young people will be able to take advantage of whatever courses the Minister of Colleges and Universities is going to announce for Sault College.

One of the things I had hoped for and asked about in the Legislature was the possibility that communities such as Sault Ste. Marie, Windsor, and others that have experienced enormous increases in their welfare roles because of the exhaustees from unemployment insurance, would receive special assistance from the government to meet the demands of their welfare budgets.

Sault Ste. Marie is going to have an increase in its welfare budget this year of 45 per cent. When I raised this matter with the Treasurer last week, he said, "Well, most of these communities that have been hard hit and have had this increase in welfare budgets have not had to increase their mill rates." That is true, he is quite right, they have not had to increase their mill rates significantly; but the reason they have not had to is they have cut back in other areas.

In Sault Ste. Marie they are not going to maintain their roads this year; not one bit of road maintenance. They have cut out most of their recreation programs and have transferred the people from their recreation programs to the welfare department. They have doubled the size of their welfare department with people who are not qualified social workers. They are giving them a little training and saying, "Now you are going to help us with this tremendous case load increase we have in welfare recipients."

I had hoped this government was going to suggest some assistance for those communities so we could reinstitute some of the other services that have been cut back. If we do not, we will have a very high bill next year. If we do not maintain roads and streets this year, we will have to do a lot more work next year. We are just putting off expenditures that are required; I

was disappointed not to see some specific discussion of that in the Treasurer's budget.

It is true the Treasurer did institute the so-called social services maintenance tax, the five per cent surtax on personal income tax. I suppose the Treasurer is suggesting that money might be used to assist the welfare rolls of hard-hit communities; I do not know. If it is, it is a shocking way to finance that kind of assistance. It is very disappointing.

As I said earlier, I support the suggestion for an accelerated capital works program, but I do not support a capital works program like the Treasurer's that produces only 2,400 new jobs. In the job creation program proposed last week by my colleagues the member for Windsor-Riverside (Mr. Cooke) and the member for Port Arthur (Mr. Foulds), it was suggested that instead of \$82 million, the government should be prepared to fund capital works programs at a rate of about \$300 million. That would really produce 12,000 jobs, rather than 2,400 under the guise of 12,000 as the Treasurer has proposed.

In my region we are lucky; I suppose that is the term we should use. In some areas we are getting some capital works assistance. For instance, after two years of discussion, Ontario Hydro is going ahead with the erosion control project in Iron Bridge on the Mississagi River. There are many others that could be proceeded with.

Certainly, the White River water and sewer project is required and should go ahead in Wawa. We could be building an extended care facility to help elderly and disabled people stay in their own communities even if they are not able to stay in their own homes. The Wawa sewage lagoon system is overtaxed and should be expanded. The Blind River water and sewer works are outdated and need to be upgraded. These are all things that could be done.

In the Sault Ste. Marie area, 75 per cent of the building trades are unemployed; 75 per cent of construction workers in our area are out of work. We should be providing employment for those people. Right now the only thing they have to provide major employment is the Eldorado plant at Blind River and that is winding down. So the few jobs that have been available in construction are disappearing. The Hemlo mining exploration will produce some short-term construction jobs but not very many.

Although people on the other side of this House fail to recognize on most occasions that anyone on this side can represent a farming area, my riding does include a large number of

farmers, mainly dairy and beef. We welcome the fact that the government has finally responded to the proposals made by this caucus for assistance to young farmers through interest rate reduction. But I want to point out that kind of program does nothing for established farmers who are facing serious problems with interest rates. There are a lot of them in my area. Even dairy farmers who normally have a more stable income are facing serious difficulties.

The beef industry has always faced ups and downs. There was a sale at the Thessalon stockyards last weekend and the prices for beef cattle were pretty good compared to what they have been in the past. But those farmers who received good prices will face problems, as will the whole economy, if interest rates rise again this summer. Certainly they will have problems as the price for feed continues to rise, especially in the light of the recent announcements of programs in the United States which have made the shortages of certain seeds inevitable in North America.

10:10 p.m.

The member for Prescott-Russell (Mr. Boudria) referred at length to the proposal under the Board of Industrial Leadership and Development program for the expansion of one million acres of farm land in eastern and northern Ontario through tile drainage. With him, I regret very much that this was not dealt with adequately at all in the budget. We propose in our job creation budget that there be a major tile drainage program, which would be funded at an additional \$25 million and would produce 2,000 more jobs as well as assist farmers in improving their farm lands and their production.

If we are really going to assist the farmers we have got to make it possible for them to borrow at reasonable rates so they can continue to operate with some hope of stability in interest rates. Certainly interest rates have dropped recently, but there is no guarantee that we are not going to see an increase in them again. We believe interest rates should be provided at eight per cent by this government for loans up to \$50,000 over 10 years, and we believe the government should be prepared to provide \$25 million for this kind of program. We also estimate it would produce about 1,600 new jobs.

One of the other proposals in our job creation program was for small-scale hydroelectric developments. Ontario Hydro has recognized that there are 17 small sites that could be developed for hydraulic electricity generation, but we all know the bias of Ontario Hydro. That corpora-

tion is controlled by the massive numbers of people in the nuclear program, and the two or three people who are left in the hydraulic program are pretty well voices in the wilderness in that corporation.

Unless there is a government program—a government will to go ahead with hydraulic generation—Ontario Hydro will never do it. Even the three sites of the 17 they have identified as the most likely ones to proceed with will not go ahead unless the government tells Ontario Hydro this is the route it wants them to go.

This would produce a number of jobs in our area. We believe that in the first year we could produce up to 5,000 jobs if the government were serious about the hydraulic generation program.

As well, the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Bernier) has made a lot of to-do about the availability of peat resources in northern Ontario and the fact we have such a wealth of this resource in the province, one of the highest amounts of peat in the world. We have had reports from the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Pope) and a lot of talk from the Minister of Northern Affairs, but they have not come up with anything.

We believe we should emulate Finland, Ireland and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. We have 26 million hectares of peat, the equivalent of 24 billion barrels of oil, and if we were to institute a program of \$20 million, we could produce jobs and perhaps assist small northern communities, at least initially, to generate power for themselves and become self-sufficient in power along the Finnish example. I wonder why this government is not plugging into the proposals that have been made by the Finns, which could apply to northern Ontario and provide for this kind of generation.

My colleague the member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Charlton) raised an issue this afternoon, along with other members of this caucus, regarding the cutbacks in the Ministry of the Environment's budget at a time when acid rain is a major problem in this province and in North America. We have had studies that have shown that if we continue at the present rate of destruction of our lakes, we will lose about 6,000 jobs in the tourist industry alone as a result of the effects of acid rain on our northern lakes.

It is obvious that if Inco and Falconbridge were to be required by this government to cut their emissions, we could produce many jobs; we estimate about 3,000. We would be preserving jobs in the future in the tourist industry and we would be preserving the recreation for the

people of this province. Obviously Ontario Hydro is not concerned with this issue in that it has cancelled its scrubbers program, one we believe should be going ahead and be expanded, and which would provide jobs at the same time.

For the life of me, I have never been able to understand why this government does not realize there are jobs in environmental protection. At the very time Algoma Steel is laying off employees and cutting back, it applies to the Ministry of the Environment for a one-year postponement in its pollution abatement program for the St. Marys River and the smoke-stack emissions.

It appears the Ministry of the Environment is going to grant the postponement because of the economic situation of Algoma Steel. The program for pollution abatement was related to a modernization program at that plant, and if Algoma Steel were going to proceed with that kind of program, there would be construction jobs for some of the 75 per cent of construction workers who are out of work in our area and we would be providing a future for Sault Ste. Marie and Algoma.

But this government feels that in a period of recession we should be cutting back, that we should not be expanding our environmental protection.

Another area that is obviously one of the most effective and least expensive ways of stimulating the economy and producing construction jobs is in housing. Obviously, in our area, this is very important not only for the construction industry but also for the lumber industry.

In my riding, in places such as White River and in the Sault Ste. Marie area as well, many cutters and millworkers have been laid off for a long period. Some of them are just now getting back to work as the housing market seems to be improving in the United States. In the budget, the Treasurer projects 53,000 new housing starts this year. We know he was off by a substantial amount last year, and that if he is off by as much this year it will only be about 41,000.

I fail to understand why this government would cancel one of the most successful programs it has had, the Ontario home renewal program, which provides employment and rehabilitation of housing in the small and large communities of Ontario at the very time we have unemployment at these levels. We believe we should be getting into rehabilitation in construction of homes in a big way. We would propose a \$50-million improvement in OHRP

rather than cancelling it, so that it could provide at least 2,000 jobs.

Also, we believe we should be responding to the needs of senior citizens for the more than 9,500 units required across Ontario. In my riding we need senior citizens' housing in Thessalon, Blind River, Bruce Mines and the Echo Bay-Desbarats area. Why is this government not doing all it can to provide the senior citizens housing and the employment that would accrue from that in a period of high unemployment in the construction industry?

We believe there could be a two-year program that would provide 10,000 units over those two years, for a cost of \$223 million, and we could employ over 11,000 people across Ontario.

On a local issue, we hope this government will move and have an agreement with the federal government for retrofitting homes that have high radiation levels in Blind River. I understand from the Minister of Labour (Mr. Ramsay) that he will have a meeting with the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Mr. Bennett) and the mayor of Blind River to discuss that on Monday, May 16, 1983. The Minister of Labour would have liked me to come, but for some reason the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing does not want an opposition member present.

I will of course be meeting with the mayor and the Minister of Labour after that meeting, and I will encourage them to proceed. If the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing can find it in his budget to provide the funding that is required, I will be thankful and I will not in any way misunderstand his inability to talk to people from the other side of the House.

10:20 p.m.

One of the other major needs we have as a result of distance is in the provision of health care—not just the homemakers that I was referring to, but real outpatient care in the communities where the people live. With the distances we have in northern Ontario we need to have health care clinics established.

In one community in my area, Dubreuilville, we have been fighting for a clinic for a number of years, but the Ministry of Northern Affairs has been very slow, as has the Ministry of Health, to allocate the funding. We believe we could provide 75 centres in a concerted effort to provide health care in small communities and neighbourhoods.

In this regard too, I want to point out that one of the findings of the occupational health and safety task force that my colleague from Sudbury

East (Mr. Martel) chaired was the great benefit of workers' clinics, such as the one that was in operation in Hamilton and hopefully will be in operation again soon, for providing workers with protection and assistance.

I would encourage the government and the Minister of Labour to respond to recommendation 47 for the establishment of independent occupational health clinics in every major industrial city. They would be funded collectively by employers but would remain under worker control. These are the kinds of things that are necessary if we are going to provide workers with the protection they need.

I want to emphasize that I cannot accept the argument that has been made time and again by the Minister of Labour that in a period of recession we cannot improve protection for workers; that in a bad economic climate we cannot enforce the Occupational Health and Safety Act, we cannot ensure that workers are given the protection they deserve.

I find it particularly distasteful that a Mr. Cohen, from the Minister of Labour's office, would be quoted on the Canadian Broadcasting Corp. in northern Ontario just this week as stating there was nothing in the health and safety task force that was new, and that people realized the ministry could not employ more inspectors at this time of recession, even if more inspectors were needed to enforce the act. He stated it was really up to the unions to protect their membership in terms of health and safety.

That is an example of what the Ministry of Labour and what this government believe about health and safety in the work place. It is a most unfortunate belief.

I have already mentioned the homemakers service that I believe should be expanded. I want to say, though, that in some cases the government obviously is not going to be able to provide the kind of acute care that is needed by people in the smaller communities of northern Ontario. I have to admit that; it would be nice if we could provide it, but it is not economically feasible and it also is very difficult to attract the professionals to any of the smaller northern communities.

In that regard I think it is imperative that the government expand the northern air ambulance service. I know the government has done so in the past, but I am talking about helicopters, heliports, and so on.

Mr. Boudria: What about jets?

Mr. Wildman: No. These are beneficial, but it is not going to help very much as long as there is

a regulation that requires that a person be transferred from one hospital to another before he or she gets OHIP coverage for transportation, if the person is not on a stretcher.

As long as there is a situation where people have to pay their transportation unless they are lying on a stretcher, or they have to be in a hospital before they can qualify to be transferred to another hospital, people who need ongoing specialist care and specialized care in the large communities of this province are not going to have the same access to it that people have in southern Ontario and the larger communities in the north.

All of us in this province pay the same OHIP premiums. We, all of us, pay taxation to the health care system. We all are paying for the specialized services, and the specialized facilities that are available in the large communities. We all have a right to have access to them and OHIP should cover the cost of transportation to those services.

I have gone on at length talking about short-term employment, the need for job creation programs and the failure of this budget to respond to those needs. I do not make any apologies for concentrating on short-term employment because I said at the beginning of my participation in this debate that we have a major short-term problem in Sault Ste. Marie and Algoma, one that has to be responded to and one that has not been adequately dealt with by the Treasurer.

I have been asked a number of times by reporters since the so-called budget leak of last week whether I thought the Treasurer should resign. Initially I said that if the leak were as serious as it appeared to be, perhaps he should resign according to parliamentary tradition. But after seeing the substance of the budget, I can only say I do not care what the Treasurer does.

What we have is a Conservative budget presented by a Conservative Treasurer representing a Conservative government. I mean conservative both in the capital-C and small-c aspects. If we trade this Treasurer for another Conservative Treasurer from the same Conservative government, we will end up with a similar Conservative budget.

Mr. Boudria: We need a Liberal government, that is what we need.

Mr. Wildman: If we have a Liberal government, we will have an even more conservative budget such as Marc Lalonde's at the federal level.

I will conclude by dealing shortly with the

question that is always legitimately raised when we talk about job creation, and that is how does one pay for it.

We believe the total cost of creating 150,000 new jobs in 1983-84 would be approximately \$2 billion. Of that, \$700 million could be raised through increased tax revenues and progressive taxes such as succession duty and corporation taxes. Then \$1 billion would be raised through borrowing, similar to what the Treasurer is doing. The difference is the borrowing we would be doing would be for productive measures producing jobs. It would not be what this Treasurer is doing in failing to respond to the need for job creation in Ontario.

We are quite upfront about the fact we would be increasing the deficit by \$1 billion and we make no apologies for that proposal at a time of recession. Cutting back when people are out of work does not make any sense. It is the same kind of thing R. B. Bennett did in the 1930s and we know what kind of situation that produced for the unemployed of this country.

Also, the Treasurer is not willing to be as honest with the public as we are. He wants to play games with his deficit. He says he has a deficit of \$2.7 billion. Then he says he wants to take \$300 million out of what has already been proposed for the various programs in the budget and he is not counting that as part of his deficit. In fact, he has a deficit of \$3 billion and he does not want to tell the people that. Why is he so afraid?

This is a cutback budget. It takes \$21 million from municipalities and housing programs at a time when we should be expanding and assisting in those areas. Instead of putting money into the pockets of consumers, it takes money from them. It means a cutback in services. We not only have an increase of five per cent surtax on personal income tax, but we have a five per cent increase in OHIP premiums. We have the so-called sin tax increases.

For every \$1 put in the pockets of consumers through the sales tax holiday, we are taking about \$7 out of their pockets for the provincial Treasurer. Whatever stimulus is proposed by the sales tax holiday is more than cancelled out by the other tax changes of the Treasurer.

We propose a short-term job creation program of 150,000 jobs; the Treasurer projects 93,000 more jobless. This is not a job creation budget, it is not an economic-growth stimulation budget. It is a stand-pat budget at best. It does nothing about the unemployment rate we have in this province. At worst, it is a cutback budget,

which will cut programs and services that are needed at the very time we are in a heavy recession.

10:30 p.m.

The Treasurer is doing the exact opposite of what he should be doing. He is not responding to the challenge of the 1980s; he is not going to get the economy moving; he is not providing new jobs; he is not going to pull this province out of the recession. At best, it is just going to continue as it is; at worst, it is going to make the whole situation much worse.

I am very disappointed in this budget, and I hope that over the next few weeks we will be able to persuade the government not to change the Treasurer but to change its budgetary program.

On motion by Mr. Treleaven, the debate was adjourned.

INCOME TAX SURCHARGE

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to standing order 28(b), the member for Scarborough West has given notice of his dissatisfaction with the answer to his question given by the Treasurer and Minister of Economics (Mr. F. S. Miller) concerning the social service maintenance tax, and I shall be prepared to listen to him for up to five minutes.

Mr. R. F. Johnston: Mr. Speaker, the reason I asked for this late show was because of the arrogance of the way in which the Treasurer replied to my question, and I see he is following through tonight by not respecting the rules of this House and not appearing for this small debate. I would suggest it is an indication of the attitude of this government.

The Treasurer has made a great point of saying he uses this surtax to get some of the money out there for purchasing power; that people have too much money in savings, etc. I raised questions about how this was going to hurt people on low incomes.

On page 17 of his budget he says lower income Ontarians will be protected from this surtax. I asked whether he thought people who earned \$3.70 an hour are wealthy people, whether they have an awful lot of money sitting around in their savings accounts that they need to get out and spend. Those people are earning \$148 a week, and those people are going to be subject to this tax. A family of four earning \$12,500 will be subject to this surtax.

I am saying his line that lower-income people

will be protected is so much balderdash and that he needs to rethink his surtax.

He also says on page 17, "those citizens of Ontario who have jobs will contribute a modest additional amount to ensure that decent public programs and job creation initiatives are paid for without undue increases in our deficit." He is talking about citizens with jobs.

I asked him a question as to whether or not people on unemployment insurance benefits would be forced to pay this surtax. I indicated to him that the average unemployment insurance claim at the moment in Ontario is \$155.93 a week; that puts those people over the minimum amount that he has talked about.

If he wants it to be people who are employed who are paying this, then surely he should be exempting those who are on unemployment insurance. These are people who are in need of those decent public programs he is talking about. These are people who are in need of the job initiatives he says the government needs to create, yet he is asking them to pay for the programs. It is just ludicrous.

I got no answer. I got a one-word "no" as he said this was not regressive, and then he had the nerve to sit down. Now he has the nerve not to appear here tonight to indicate why that kind of regressive action is necessary at this time.

In my supplementary I raised the ludicrous inconsistency of saying that people who are too poor to be expected to pay their Ontario health insurance plan premiums are not too poor to pay this surtax, and I got no satisfaction on that answer either. One can have a taxable income of \$3,500 in this province and supposedly be eligible for the assistance program for the premiums, yet the Treasurer's cutoff is \$2,178 taxable income for his surtax. That is totally inconsistent.

How is it that people can be too poor to pay

the OHIP premiums, which the government has boosted again, and yet are supposedly going to carry job creation programs and more social services projects on their backs? It is a total farce, Mr. Speaker. If he had any guts or any sense, he would do as we suggested, which was to put a surtax on those who can pay.

People with incomes over \$30,000 net should be picking up these costs, not people who are earning \$3.70 an hour, not people who are on unemployment insurance, not people who happen to be on UIC and have a partner who has a part-time job.

He would not even respond to that and again, he is not here tonight to respond to it. I am basically giving notice tonight that he is going to hear an awful lot more about this. This kind of unjust increase on the backs of people who cannot afford it is not the way we should be funding social programs. If he is really just adding a tax increase for the vast majority of people in Ontario, he should say so and not pretend it is some surtax upon the wealthy.

In my question today, I pointed out to him that it is not only the wealthy who are paying for this, it is the poor as well. If this minister and this government had any respect for the poor and the unemployed in Ontario, they would not levy this tax against them. I regret again that this Legislature and our process are being ignored by a minister of the crown and that he does not feel he should come here tonight and explain why he did not give me a fuller answer this afternoon.

Mr. Di Santo: Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether I can use the 10 minutes that the minister should have used and report—

Mr. Speaker: I think not.

The House adjourned at 10:37 p.m.

CONTENTS

Thursday, May 12, 1983

Budget debate

Mr. Gillies.	697
Mr. Boudria.	702
Mr. Wildman.	708

Other business

Income tax surcharge, Mr. R. F. Johnston.	720
Adjournment.	721

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Allen, R. (Hamilton West NDP)
 Boudria, D. (Prescott-Russell L)
 Breagh, M. J. (Oshawa NDP)
 Cassidy, M. (Ottawa Centre NDP)
 Charlton, B. A. (Hamilton Mountain NDP)
 Cousens, D., Deputy Chairman and Acting Speaker (York Centre PC)
 Di Santo, O. (Downsview NDP)
 Gillies, P. A. (Brantford PC)
 Gordon, J. K. (Sudbury PC)
 Johnson, J. M. (Wellington-Dufferin-Peel PC)
 Johnston, R. F. (Scarborough West NDP)
 Mackenzie, R. W. (Hamilton East NDP)
 Miller, G. I. (Haldimand-Norfolk L)
 Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
 Pollock, J. (Hastings-Peterborough PC)
 Rotenberg, D. (Wilson Heights PC)
 Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
 Turner, Hon. J. M., Speaker (Peterborough PC)
 Walker, Hon. G. W., Minister of Industry and Trade (London South PC)
 Wildman, B. (Algoma NDP)



No. 21

Hansard

Official Report of Debates

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Third Session, 32nd Parliament
Friday, May 13, 1983

Speaker: Honourable John M. Turner
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

Published by the Legislative Assembly of Ontario
Editor of Debates: Peter Brannan

CONTENTS

Contents of the proceedings reported in this issue of Hansard appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of the speakers taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is \$15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, Information Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 965-2238.



LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Friday, May 13, 1983

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers.

DEATH OF WILLIAM GOODFELLOW

Mr. Sheppard: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: I would like to bring to the attention of the House the fact that Bill Goodfellow died in his sleep on Tuesday morning. He was the member for Northumberland for 20 years, from 1943 to 1963, and a cabinet minister for 18 years, holding four portfolios. I am just bringing it to the attention of the House and to the members and friends he knew over those good many years that he represented the great riding of Northumberland.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Cousens): I thank the honourable member. On behalf of all members, I ask that the House express our sympathy to the Goodfellow family and acknowledge the gracious words of the member for Northumberland and certainly the great service of Mr. Goodfellow to this province and to the people of this country.

SIMILARITY OF BILLS

Mr. Philip: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: I would ask you to consider this and perhaps bring back a ruling to the House as early as next week on it. It may have already come to your attention that the recent actions of the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry) may well be in violation of standing order 39. I refer you to the fact that on May 10 this minister introduced Bill 32, which, with respect, is a duplication of Bill 11, which I had introduced on April 19. The purpose of standing order 39 is to prevent unnecessary repetition.

Notwithstanding the fact that in introducing Bill 32 the Attorney General credited three Tory back-benchers with bringing this to his attention, even though the Federation of Metro Tenants' Associations had met with him and pleaded that he pass the bill I had introduced, and notwithstanding that this is not the first time the Attorney General has plagiarized bills from the opposition and taken personal credit without having the grace to acknowledge the opposition for having introduced them, I would like

to advise you that if it is your opinion that the Attorney General is in violation of standing order 39 I would be happy to withdraw my bill, because it is terribly important that this legislation pass forthwith, be it under my name or that of the Attorney General.

The Acting Speaker: I thank the honourable member and I will refer his point to the Speaker, who can then deal with it.

ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

Mr. R. F. Johnston: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: Yesterday, you may remember, I expressed my dissatisfaction with an answer given to a question under standing order 28(a) by the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller). The question was about the fact that the tax that is being imposed is also going to affect a number of very poor people in this province.

As a result we had what is known as the late show last night, but lately the late show has been turning into a no show with respect to the ministers coming to participate in that debate.

The Acting Speaker: I do not see that your privilege has been abrogated or—

Mr. R. F. Johnston: I understand that under standing order 28(b) it is a matter of the right of the minister to reply if he so wishes, I understand that; but surely in the spirit of those sections of our standing orders the idea is to give the opposition an opportunity to have a debate, not speak to an empty chair.

I would ask the Speaker to perhaps refer this matter back to the standing committee on procedural affairs so that we can look at this again, because it is not serving as another opportunity for members of the opposition to have a debate on a matter they think has been brusquely put aside, instead it is being used as a chance for us to talk to empty chairs on the other side.

The Acting Speaker: I thank the honourable member for raising this point. Your rights are clearly defined in the standing orders and I will take no further action on it.

Mr. Laughren: Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak to the same point of order, if I might.

The Acting Speaker: I have already listened

at some length on it. Are you going to say anything different?

Mr. Laughren: I would like to suggest to the Speaker that he at least ask the procedural affairs committee to look into this, because the Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Drea) decided the same way the Treasurer did this week, not to bother to appear to provide for what we think are important rights of the opposition in this House.

The Acting Speaker: May the honourable members all realize that the standing committee on procedural affairs is looking at all the rules of the House, and I am sure those who are here this morning can be advised of the comments made.

Hon. Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, the problem with my nonappearance was that I was not informed about the matter.

Mr. Laughren: Nonsense.

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY DEVELOPMENTALLY HANDICAPPED PEOPLE

Hon. Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, in keeping with my commitment to provide satisfactory support services and training opportunities for those developmentally handicapped people who are returning to the community, I am today tabling five documents prepared by my ministry in co-operation with associations for the mentally retarded and a number of other charitable and private organizations. These documents will serve to demonstrate that, contrary to some assumptions that have been made in this House and elsewhere, the transfer of developmentally handicapped people from institutions to community living settings is being accomplished through the most careful planning.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, my ministry is determined to provide as many developmentally handicapped individuals as possible with the opportunity for a richer life in the community. To achieve this we have, first, developed comprehensive tests to assess the ability of each resident of an institution to function in the larger community. We have gone on to identify the individual needs of those residents returning to the community for support services and training in occupational and life skills.

The documents before the House today are a result of a year of joint effort between officials of my ministry and representatives of those charitable organizations working with the developmentally handicapped in the community. This material has already been mailed to local

associations for the mentally retarded, other nonprofit organizations serving the developmentally handicapped and operators of training workshops.

Volume 1 is a compendium of assessment services available throughout Ontario.

Volume 2 reviews various methods of assessment to assist those working with the developmentally handicapped in determining which of those methods are appropriate for the individuals concerned.

Volume 3 sets out proposed standards and guidelines for individual program planning, in which it is envisaged that the developmentally handicapped themselves and their families will take part. The need for standards and guidelines was identified in the report of the Task Force on Individual Program Planning, a body with representation from the Ontario Association for the Mentally Retarded as well as the ministry.

The proposals in volume 3 formalize and build on the expertise gained through practical experience over the last decade in Ontario and elsewhere. We have invited the organizations that serve the developmentally handicapped to provide written submissions on these proposals by July 29 of this year. A series of meetings starting next Monday, has been arranged to facilitate this process.

10:10 a.m.

Volume 4 deals with community residential services for the developmentally handicapped. It proposes ways to resolve problems that have arisen in the operation of community residences in the past and ways to improve future planning of these residences. It also sets out a range of options for community living settings and services, particularly for the more severely handicapped.

Volume 5 contains issues raised in a review of workshop programs in Ontario and presents the views of the ministry regarding workshops in the future. It is concerned with ways to revitalize workshops, including the improvement of training programs, plant and equipment.

We are inviting written submissions on volumes 4 and 5 of the series by the end of September this year.

What all these documents amount to is a three-stage plan—for each of the individuals concerned—to make the transition from the institution to the community a trouble-free and, indeed, a rewarding experience. That plan provides for comprehensive assessment, the setting of goals and the achievement of those goals.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank all those who have worked so hard with my ministry in the development of these documents and in the larger task of helping thousands of our developmentally handicapped fellow citizens to realize their desire for a happier and more fruitful life.

FRENCH-LANGUAGE SERVICES

Hon. Mr. Wells: M. le Président, à titre de ministre responsable des services en français du gouvernement de l'Ontario, il m'a fait plaisir de déposer aujourd'hui le quatrième rapport annuel du bureau du coordinateur provincial des services en français.

For the first time this year, I am also tabling a separate directory of French-language services which previously formed part of the office's annual report. This is an indication of the extent to which these services have expanded over the past year.

May I share with all members that today we are very close to achieving our goal of ensuring that the great majority of francophones living in Ontario have access to the government's French-language services and may I also offer my congratulations to all ministries for their support in implementing these services.

The government of Ontario is now able to provide across-the-board service in French in designated areas of the province where the majority of its French-speaking residents reside.

In other areas, where there are fewer francophone residents, we are steadily working to improve the quality of service so that French-speaking citizens can obtain information or access to government services in French.

To facilitate this access, the office of the government co-ordinator provides a toll-free telephone service, Renseignements Ontario, which enables the province's francophones to obtain information on government programs and services in their own language.

One of the major highlights of the past year, was the extension of the use of French to the county, district and surrogate courts in all designated areas of the province and to the Supreme Court in three of these areas. Changes in legislation were also made to allow court cases to be heard in French in individual locations across the province. French-speaking citizens of Ontario now also have the right to register legal documents, in designated areas, in their own language.

At present, we have full-time French-language services co-ordinators in 13 ministries, who are

in constant contact with the public. Most of the ministries have a formal action plan for the implementation and delivery of French-language services.

One of our major priorities in this past year has been to expand the application of the French-language services policy to various government agencies, boards and commissions, many of which have direct impact on the daily lives of Ontarians.

In recent months we in Ontario have developed a particularly close relationship with Manitoba and New Brunswick, exchanging experiences, expertise and proposals for the most effective improvement in the delivery of services to our respective French-speaking minorities. In many instances, the practices and structures we have in Ontario have served as models to governments in these other provinces.

I would also like to mention again and emphasize the recent announcements in the speech from the throne relating to my colleague the Minister of Education (Miss Stephenson). Later this year the minister will be introducing legislation to provide for an unqualified right to a French-language elementary and secondary education for any French-speaking student in Ontario. The legislation will also provide for the strengthening of the Languages of Instruction Commission and the election of minority-language school trustees who will be responsible for many of the decisions affecting French-language education in Ontario. I mention this again because I believe it to be a significant step forward for francophone rights in Ontario.

I believe the annual report I am presenting today demonstrates the very real commitment this government has towards the implementation of French-language policy and the delivery of French-language services throughout this province.

GRAIN ELEVATOR STORAGE BILL

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, today I will be introducing a bill for first reading which will revise and update the Grain Elevator Storage Act. The purpose of this bill is to safeguard the property rights of producers who deliver grain to an elevator for storage. The proposed legislation makes it clear that farm produce held in an elevator for storage remains the property of the producer even when subject to a written agreement to sell.

In past years, once grain was in the elevators and a contract for sale had been signed, confusion sometimes arose as to who owned the farm

produce in question, the producer or the elevator operator, especially when creditors took over the business operation. This confusion was compounded by the tickets and forms used in the actual transactions between the parties. When elevator operations fell into financial difficulties, financial institutions would seize all the contents in the elevators, including stored farm produce. Legal battles ensued as the rightful owners tried to regain or be compensated for their property.

The bill before the House would guarantee that all grain delivered to an elevator would be deemed intended for storage, unless the contrary is established in writing or before a court. Further, the forms used in the transactions would be separated and clarified under the revised legislation. It would further clarify the position of the producer in sales transactions by declaring that the owner retains title to the grain until he receives his money.

The chief inspector would have appropriate powers to implement these provisions, including the authority to seal bins and seize, remove and sell stored grain. Such powers are deemed necessary to safeguard the interests of the owners of farm produce. These powers are also necessary because of the perishable nature of the produce and could be invoked, for example, if the elevator operator becomes insolvent or abandons the facility.

This bill responds to representations by the producer marketing boards involved and by the chief inspector, Mr. Bill Taylor, who is a highly respected figure in the grain industry. The contents have also been discussed with the Ontario Grain and Feed Dealers Association. Those concerned appear to be supportive of these measures in their present form, given the recent responses we have received from the industry. Therefore, I am introducing this legislation for first reading in the hope of revising existing legislation as expeditiously as possible.

ORAL QUESTIONS

JOB CREATION

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Treasurer. Is he aware that when he nets out the figures from his budget he is creating only 9,000 new jobs this year over the growth in the work force? By that rate of job creation, it is going to take until 2037 to put people back to work. Surely he would agree that is a totally inadequate response, given the amount of unemployment in this province.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I do not think one should be projecting to 2037 when it is hard to project to the next year.

Mr. Peterson: The Treasurer does not have the world's greatest record as a projector of anything.

Let me quote his own words in the *Globe and Mail* this morning, "You don't suddenly recreate all the lost jobs, but we are doing so at a fairly good rate." Is he telling us that 9,000 jobs a year is a good rate? Is he aware that for an unemployed 19-year-old today it would take until he is 73 to get a job at this rate of job creation? Surely the Treasurer would agree that is not a good enough response.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I do not know how the honourable member does his arithmetic. I said, and I do not think the member challenged me, that the number of people who would be at work in December this year would be 65,000 more than the number of people at work in December last year.

Mr. Peterson: But look at the growth of the work force. Does the Treasurer not understand his own budget?

Hon. F. S. Miller: The member asked how many more people were at work. I am responding to him.

10:20 a.m.

Mr. Cooke: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact there are about 17,000 people who are running out of unemployment insurance and having to go on the welfare rolls every month in this province, does the Treasurer really believe his figures—whether it be of 9,000 jobs created by this province or even the other figures he has thrown out in the last couple of days—are adequate to meet the need in this province?

When the Treasurer said the other day that he might bring down a mini-budget in the fall, was that an indication that it took him only 24 hours to come to the same conclusion we came to, that this budget was inadequate?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, let me clarify that comment on the mini-budget. I think the press reported it fairly. Sometimes the headline above a story indicates more than the content of the story.

I was asked whether or not I could find the \$300 million shown in the budget and, if so, where. I said I expected to be working through transfer payments and other ways with Management Board to try to find that \$300 million. The next question was: "What would happen if you did not? If by fall those moneys were not

discovered, would it be necessary to have another budget?"

I said I had noticed on the federal scene in the last couple of years that, with a volatile economy, it was necessary for them to have at least one budget statement and one budget a year. I could not rule that out, but I certainly was not predicting it either. The world could be going much better in the fall or much worse than currently presumed. Only then would one make that decision. Do not rule out things, but do not predict them; that is all I was trying to say.

Mr. Peterson: I am going to remind the Treasurer of the figures in his own budget. He predicted 65,000 new jobs. According to his budget, there are 56,000 new entrants to the work force; net 9,000 new jobs. That is all that comes out of this budget when it happens.

Mr. Rotenberg: That's nonsense; 65,000 new jobs.

Mr. Peterson: It is net 9,000 new jobs. Those are his figures and he should understand them. He is of course aware we have lost some 489,000 jobs since August 1981. Those are the figures. Surely his response to this most critical problem is not adequate. Why did he not choose to make a more active attack on this most important problem?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Even by my befuddled arithmetic, if 56,000 more people are added to the work force, and I agree that is very likely, and if 65,000 more people are at work, I do not see that I have 9,000 new jobs. I have 65,000 new jobs.

Mr. Peterson: The Treasurer had better understand the difference between net and gross and how these figures are worked out or he will be in serious trouble.

RENTAL HOUSING

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, let me go on to a new question that does relate to employment. I think it was a year ago tomorrow the Treasurer's colleague announced, with his complicity, the great Challenge 2000 program whereby the government promised to spend \$58 million earmarked for rental housing stimulation programs. Not one penny of that was spent.

Now in the budget, the Treasurer has said he will spend \$16 million this fiscal year on rental housing stimulation programs. Of that, \$10 million is earmarked for two or three small pilot projects and another \$6 million for rental subsidies.

How can he claim he is attacking that most serious problem of lack of accommodation in

this province, and on the other hand attacking with it the unemployment problem, with such an inadequate response in an area that has the capacity to create so many jobs?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, in the prebudget meetings, I met with the housing industry, the Housing and Urban Development Association of Canada and the Urban Development Institute on the same day. I will be addressing UDI at lunch today.

At the time they came in, they said words to this effect to me: "If we were giving you advice, we would suggest the housing industry in general is recovering reasonably well. There must be better ways for government to spend its money this year. However, if you choose to do some pump-priming, of course we would appreciate some extension of programs such as the renter-buy program last year because it was so outstandingly successful."

My friend may not wish to admit it, but I think we had some 16,000 applications under the renter-buy program where a \$5,000 interest-free loan was given for 10 years. It seems to have had the desired effect, not only of stimulating the creation of housing but also of freeing up apartments, because about half the people who qualified moved out of apartments. I would have argued we covered both bases with one program.

At present, we estimate 55,000 starts in Ontario this year, up from 38,000-odd last year. That would seem to be a dramatic increase. Surely the member would also agree that when an industry seems to be recovering by itself it is not the time to add more to it.

Also, registered home ownership savings plan programs at the federal level were quite generous, giving, I am told, a tax benefit of up to \$5,000 by themselves this year. Surely, again, I should not duplicate something the federal government is doing which will have the same desired effect.

Mr. Peterson: I understand the crisis is not in the single-family housing area in that sense; it is in the rental area. Surely the minister will recognize there is still a problem. I would like him to address himself to that part of the problems we are facing.

The minister is aware we have 178,000 unemployed in Toronto yet the vacancy rate is 1.2 per cent. In Oshawa there are 8,000 unemployed and the vacancy rate is 1.3 per cent; Ottawa 36,000 unemployed, vacancy rate 0.3 per cent; Hamilton 39,000 out of work, vacancy rate 1.2

per cent; Thunder Bay 9,000 out of work, vacancy rate 1.3 per cent.

These are all very low vacancy rates. Surely the minister could have directed funds into the rental area—I am not talking about the single-family area—that would have immediately created jobs. That area is very responsive to any kind of stimulation. Would that not have been a reasonable area for the Treasurer to attack in his budget?

Hon. F. S. Miller: The \$6 million the member alluded to as rental supplement is not rental supplement. I think the ministry will be describing exactly what it is later on. It has the net effect of many more dollars. In the year before last when rental housing was assisted it was by interest-free loans of some considerable size. This year the subsidy will be in another form with the same net effect.

Let me go back to that point. If people in apartments have the ability and the desire to buy homes, they will be freeing up an apartment by doing so. Does the member not accept the fact that the two objectives—the employment of people and the freeing up of apartments through the sale of homes—are achieved at one time?

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, I think the Treasurer is to be congratulated. He announced today he expected housing starts to be 55,000 and in the budget he said it was going to be only 53,000. That is an increase of 2,000 in two days. That is a demonstration of just how remarkable this Treasurer has been in terms of his predictive capacity. We should all congratulate him.

Interjections.

The Acting Speaker: Does the member have a question?

Mr. Rae: There are 2,000 new starts in two days. This truly is a real miracle worker we have over there on the other side. Absolutely.

The Acting Speaker: The member will ask his question.

Mr. Rae: In two days he is able to produce 2,000 new starts. I think we should all congratulate the Treasurer.

The Acting Speaker: The honourable member will ask his question.

Mr. Rae: The Treasurer said he talked with what he called the housing industry and that he spoke to HUDAC and UDI in one day. Does the Treasurer really regard HUDAC and UDI as spokesmen for those 6,000 or 7,000 seniors and

17,000 families who are on waiting lists for social housing in this province?

Hon. F. S. Miller: No, Mr. Speaker, but they are pretty familiar with it. By the way, on the 2,000 difference it was my mistake—something I do from time to time. It is something the honourable member has never learned to admit when he makes one.

Mr. Rae: I do it all the time.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Not ever. I realize the member does make mistakes, but I never hear him admit it.

Mr. Rae: You don't hear very much.

Hon. F. S. Miller: One might also look at the government with the major responsibility in that area, the federal government, which has been cutting back on its assistance in that area. I am sure my colleague when he is here will explain that.

Mr. Peterson: I will remind the Treasurer he said in the lockup that the \$6 million would be for rental subsidies. He may have some magic new program he wants to announce through his colleague which may turn out like the last one—to amount to nought.

The point I am trying to get the Treasurer to address his mind to is the question of the rental accommodation crisis. Is he happy with those vacancy rates? Does he think those are adequate to let the market forces respond? Does he think that is enough rental housing?

Does the Treasurer not feel we could have actively attacked the twin problems of lack of rental housing and unemployment by the creative approach in his budget rather than his \$16-million response this year? Even in last year's terms that is inadequate. Why did the Treasurer choose not to make an active attack in that area?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I could be wrong. I may have used the term "rental subsidy" in the lockup. I think I used the term "interest subsidy." We could argue forever and I could not prove it, but I think that is the area where we are going.

10:30 a.m.

We recognize that market forces are not giving an adequate return on new rental accommodation, because I suppose rent control has kept the bulk of the older apartments at a level of rent below that which a new apartment has to have to justify being built. So it has given us a major problem: Even though those new ones are not subject to rent control, they have to be

somewhere in the same marketplace; and for that reason, as my colleague knows, we have had to find various ways of lowering the net cost of his investment to a builder so that rental accommodation will be built.

We have had some very interesting chats before the budget, which, I guess sadly enough, did not materialize in time to be in the budget. But one thing I have learned about this business is that this government, at least, has learned in between budgets to take whatever actions are necessary to meet the problems head on and to reallocate our priorities. If we have to, we will.

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, the Treasurer will find no argument in our party that the Liberal Party and the Liberal government in Ottawa have betrayed their obligations with respect to social housing.

The Acting Speaker: Is this the question?

Mr. Rae: Given the fact that the Treasurer has known for a long time about the policies of the Liberal government in Ottawa, why has his government not recognized the fact that the government of Ontario has an obligation with respect to social housing? Can he tell us why there was no commitment in his budget with respect to social housing?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I have learned always to let the minister who is more expert provide the answer. He is not here today. I think the honourable member should wait for an answer from him.

Mr. Rae: With great respect, the Treasurer is responsible for the policies of this government. He did not hesitate to announce a program with respect to rental housing in his budget, and he did not hesitate to take all the credit in the world for those great programs he is so proud of with respect to rental housing. So if there is nothing in social housing, he is going to have to take responsibility for that too, and he is going to have to answer to this Legislature with respect to the total absence on the social housing front.

The Treasurer stated in his comments to the Globe and Mail on May 11, when he was referring to this phantom \$300 million that he now has to cut out of his budget, that the cuts will be made in the money transferred from the province to the ministries in charge of health, education and municipalities, which, if transferred, according to the budget figures, would mean a cut of roughly \$21 million in the budget for municipalities and housing.

Can the Treasurer tell us whether he has any plans for further cutbacks in housing and in

other transfer payments to the municipalities that could be used in the construction of social housing in Ontario?

Hon. F. S. Miller: My friend assumes that all cuts will be prorated equally across all parts of government. I do not think that is fair with respect to transfer payments.

I did make the comment that it was my belief that municipal governments probably were among the more efficient spenders of money and that probably they had been living with more constraints of their own making than some other recipients of provincial grants have been doing. I suggested, too, that this government has shown the way since 1975, making some internal efficiency moves almost every year to improve productivity, to eliminate excess management levels and to speed up the flow of business in government. Those have worked.

We have not always insisted on that same attention to management efficiency in all the recipients of grants. We believe they can do some of that; we believe they need to share that job with us. We believe we can save taxpayers money by doing so, and that is why there is \$300 million allocated in a general way.

I would also point out that there is a thing called a program review going on in government. It is referred to in the budget. That program review may be the source of all that \$300 million. If so, I will be happy.

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, would the Treasurer not agree with me that his method of budgeting, promising to spend in various areas and then saying, "We are going to go back and find \$300 million," is about the strangest way of budgeting one could possibly find? What he is admitting is that there is fat in his own system, which his party has been running for 40 years. Surely he should have identified it by now.

How can he in conscience maintain this threat of further cuts over people's heads as he goes around and looks for a further \$300 million in his budget? Would he not agree that any other corporate treasurer or head of a household in this province who did the same trick would be fired forthwith because he did not know what he was doing? It has never been done before in the history of budgeting in this province. Why did the Treasurer choose such a strange way to present the accounts of this province?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, it just shows how little my friend has ever had to do with saving a buck.

Mr. Kerrio: It has nothing to do with saving a buck—nothing.

The Acting Speaker: Order.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I want to tell him, there are very few corporate places that do not have to do that kind of fast move on a daily basis.

Mr. Kerrio: That's why we've got a \$2.7-billion deficit.

The Acting Speaker: Order.

Mr. Rae: Can the Treasurer confirm that the 5,000 units he is so quick to take credit for on page 13 of his budget with respect to rental accommodation would restore building levels to 1981 levels, which would mean there would still be half as many as were started in the late 1970s, in 1977 and 1978 as typical years? This would still be half the level with respect to rental accommodation in Ontario.

Given the proof of requests and pressures over the past year, not only from the co-operative movement but also from many municipalities that have nonprofit housing corporations, as well as the immense pressure on the Ontario Housing Corp. and all the other public housing corporations with respect to waiting lists in this province, how can the Treasurer justify the absence of a specific program with respect to social housing?

Does the Treasurer not recognize this absence means there are going to be thousands of people in this province who will be more poorly housed than they could have been if he had taken action?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I am sure that my colleague, given his way, would never have a privately owned home or apartment in the province; it would all have to be social, nonprofit or co-operative. It happens that the great bulk of the housing in this province is made by people who buy their own homes, rent their own apartments or build their own business.

Mr. Rae: That kind of theology is going to come as no help to those people who are looking for a decent place to live in this province, and the minister clearly does not give a damn about those people.

NIAGARA RIVER POLLUTION

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of the Environment. Can the minister confirm that eight of the 12 major industries discharging on the Canadian side of the Niagara River or of its tributaries are not currently meeting the Ministry of the Environment's objectives for discharge into natural

watercourses? Can he confirm that information with respect to two thirds of the companies on the Canadian side? If so, how does the minister feel about the major cutbacks which the Treasurer has imposed on his ministry with respect to capital investment?

I have an additional question. How does he—

The Acting Speaker: One question. The honourable member is going on.

Mr. Rae: All right. I will let it go at that.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, I think it is important for the honourable member to understand what this is in reference to. It is correct that, given the stringency of our control orders, there are several companies on the Canadian side—I believe the correct number is seven—where the suspended solids in the discharge at the moment are not meeting the requirements of the ministry. However, the companies, with the advice and supervision of our staff, are in the process of modifying their processes to achieve the standards we have established.

I think it is important for the member, in communicating with the public, to make a very clear distinction between suspended solids and the biological oxygen demand and, most important, the chemical contaminants that may exist in the discharges. The suspended solids are something very different. He ought to make that distinction so as not to mislead any people on either the Canadian or the American side of the border. We are talking about something very different from the threat that exists from discharges on the American side.

10:40 a.m.

With respect to the question of the budgetary allocations, I can assure the member that for the work we are doing in the Niagara River area there has been a substantial increase within our budget allocated towards that priority. The reductions that are reflected in the overall budgetary allocations and are part of the overall program of restraint within the government have been very carefully examined by me and by my staff in the course of the development of this year's budget. I can assure the member they are not in any way going to impact negatively upon the work we are doing.

It has obviously required some very careful examination of our priorities, but the reductions will be primarily in those areas of directly constructed and operated ministry facilities; that is, for water and sewage treatment. They will not impact on the areas of municipally constructed and operated facilities, whose fund-

ing we will continue, as we have in the past, to participate in. We will be able to meet, if my recollection is correct, all the requests for such facilities that are currently before us this fiscal year.

Mr. Rae: Can the minister confirm that while there are objectives of his ministry with respect to biochemical oxygen demand and phosphorus and suspended solids, as he has mentioned, there are as yet no objectives from his ministry for hundreds of industrial organic chemicals, such as trichloroethylene or methylene chloride? Does the minister not feel that the absence of these clear objectives in Canada and in Ontario acts as a deterrent when we in Ontario are making representations to New York state and to the American authorities with respect to chemical discharges on the American side?

Hon. Mr. Norton: I can confirm the first part of the member's question. Yes, there are and I am sure will continue to be for some time into the future, not only in this jurisdiction but also within any industrial jurisdiction, some chemicals for which we do not yet have agreed standards.

Mr. R. F. Johnston: Some?

Hon. Mr. Norton: Certainly, some. I am not pretending that is not the case, nor would the honourable member find any other responsible individual in any other jurisdiction pretending that is not the case. However, our ministry has embarked on a major effort to establish standards and to review existing standards as they relate to chemicals in our environment. I will be announcing shortly the composition of an environmental standards advisory body which will allow, as I indicated on an earlier occasion, an opportunity for public input. In the process I hope to establish public confidence in the standards we do have and will be establishing.

The Acting Speaker: I thank the minister. I think you have answered the question.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Are you sure you do not want to hear more? It is a very interesting area, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker: There is only an hour for question period.

Hon. Mr. Norton: That was just the introduction. I am sure the leader of the third party would be delighted to hear in detail about each of the standards we already have in place.

Mr. Kerrio: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the leader of the New Democratic Party is joining forces with us to fight the problems on

the Niagara River. I welcome anybody who is willing to help us in that fight.

Considering all the evidence that has been put before the minister on some of the plants discharging from the Canadian side, and more particularly those discharging from the US side, I wonder whether he would consider something I am putting in the form of a resolution, which would put a pilot plant in the city of Niagara Falls, which takes its water from the Niagara River.

Realizing the time is getting nearer when those toxics and contaminants might reach levels that are dangerous, will he consider Ontario's doing something meaningful to upgrade the research and development of a pilot plant at Niagara Falls to find out how we can best cope with the toxics in that major waterway? Would it not be in the best interests of all people across Ontario and in other jurisdictions to do that kind of research at Niagara Falls? There will be 100 per cent support from this side.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, the only incredible part of that question was the last sentence, that I would ever get 100 per cent support from that side on anything.

The Acting Speaker: The minister will answer the question.

Hon. Mr. Norton: The honourable member himself should bear in mind and constantly remind his constituents of the vigilance, testing and monitoring we are doing in the Niagara River to ensure there is no threat to the health of his constituents or any other persons depending upon that as their source of drinking water.

With regard to a pilot project, I sometimes wonder whether the member does not have a pipeline into my ministry. In fact, one of the things that—

The Acting Speaker: The minister should give us the answer to the question. He is getting diverted to a pipeline.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Or worse still, a mole. At the moment, we are looking at a proposal developed by the staff at my request for the possible development of such a pilot project. As I told the member earlier, we already have in place a system for treatment of water in another location in Ontario dealing with a situation we know is emergent.

The site of any such pilot project, if we do decide to proceed with it, has yet to be determined. Obviously, Niagara Falls and any other community in Ontario that might be faced with

similar potential problems would be given consideration as a possible location.

Mr. Charlton: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the minister of environmental bafflebag. I am sure the minister would not want unintentionally to misinform the people of Ontario by leaving the implication that there are no toxic chemicals involved in those discharges by the companies we are talking about, because there are some.

Can the minister tell us, first, in the case of the two companies currently under control orders, which have been extended on a number of occasions, is he going to prosecute those companies if they have not met the conditions in the control orders when they expire? Second, can he tell us when he will proceed to put in place control orders on the other five companies where there has been little or no improvement and, to this point, he has taken no action at all?

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, I did not at any time suggest that in the discharges there was not material present in sufficient concentration to be cause for concern. The question was raised with me as to whether they were meeting the requirements. The honourable member should not put words into my mouth.

By the way, it is not bafflebag; it is just information. I know the member does not ask questions with the hope of eliciting information; he asks questions with the hope of embarrassing somebody on this side.

The Acting Speaker: I thank the honourable minister.

Hon. Mr. Norton: If he continues to ask me questions, I am going to continue to give him information whether he likes it or not.

TREASURER'S WEDDING ANNIVERSARY

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, on a point of personal privilege, if the honourable members will allow: My privileges as a member of the House were modestly abused over the past few days in terms of a report appearing in the press that the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) was celebrating his wedding anniversary last Thursday evening.

I would like to set the record straight so my privileges would then be in order by extending on behalf of all members of the House our congratulations to the Treasurer, who is on this date celebrating his 33rd wedding anniversary and who tomorrow will be celebrating the 33rd anniversary of his 23rd year of being born. In

other words, he will be 56 years old tomorrow. I would like to extend our congratulations to him.

The Acting Speaker: We all congratulate the Treasurer.

10:40 a.m.

OHIP PREMIUMS

Ms. Copps: Mr. Speaker, I have a new question for the birthday boy.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: It's tomorrow.

Ms. Copps: Just a boy; that is it. I am surprised he has survived as long as he has around this place. It says a lot for the Treasurer.

That being said, is the Treasurer aware that as a result of his refusal in the last two budgets to increase the rate of Ontario health insurance plan premium assistance levels, more than 2,000 families in Ontario who were eligible for premium assistance in 1981 are no longer eligible? Does he feel this is a just measure in view of the five per cent personal income tax surcharge?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, since the honourable member called me a birthday boy, let me just say, a Miller by any other name is just as sweet.

The Acting Speaker: Please answer the question.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Each year we continue to review the limits for assistance for OHIP, and I suggest they are succeeding in one way that is important. Apparently a greater number of people are taking advantage of the exemptions as they exist today. We looked at them again this year and we felt they were still relevant and fair. I suggest that has to be done each year as long as we have full to partial exemptions on OHIP premiums available.

Ms. Copps: With respect, the reason more people are taking advantage of the exemptions is that finally the government is beginning to let people know they are available. Certainly we are happy that people know they are available, but when a family with a 1981 income of between \$9,779 and \$10,630 is no longer eligible for premium assistance, it would seem to me that the Treasurer should have used his very extensive clout in cabinet—

The Acting Speaker: Supplementary?

Ms. Copps: The supplementary is coming. Why did the Treasurer not use his extensive clout in cabinet to bring the doctors in under the legislation in the spirit of the wage restraint legislation? He would have had \$82 million

available for programs that are needed for people at an income level of \$10,000.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Just for the record, it is interesting to see that 259,000 policy holders were receiving full premium assistance in January 1982, and 398,000 were this year. That is an increase of almost 140,000. I think the program has been reasonably—

Mr. Bradley: Free advertising.

Hon. F. S. Miller: That is interesting. Of course we have advertised it, and the member for St. Catharines (Mr. Bradley) keeps telling us we should not do that. One would have to say the advertising in this kind of case, the availability of a government program, is only understood through conscientious, carefully spent money, to let the public know what programs they are entitled to.

Mr. Cooke: Mr. Speaker, is it not true that to get around the Inflation Restraint Act, under which he was restricted to increasing OHIP premiums by only five per cent, the Treasurer decided instead to bring in a five per cent surcharge on income tax? Is that not another example of the dishonesty of the budget he presented last Tuesday?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I guess I see honesty perhaps differently from the way the honourable member does. I believe it was a very honest budget.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege: It was brought to my attention that before my arrival in the House this morning the member for Etobicoke (Mr. Philip) rose on a point of personal privilege and suggested the Attorney General was guilty of some plagiarism with respect to the introduction of a bill—

The Acting Speaker: Could I ask the Attorney General to make this point following question period? The point of personal privilege was made before question period.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I thought it could be made at the first opportunity.

The Acting Speaker: No, it was not during question period. I will call upon you immediately following question period for this point of privilege.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McClellan: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Treasurer another question on the Ontario health insurance plan and premium assistance.

Now that we have the Peterson increase of five per cent in OHIP premiums, which has

raised premiums to \$680 a year—and the Treasurer will surely acknowledge that is a crushing burden for many low-income workers, in particular for people on unemployment insurance who are not eligible for premium assistance—I would like to ask the Treasurer why so many recipients of unemployment insurance are not receiving premium assistance.

Can the Treasurer tell us his estimate of how many of the 427,000 unemployment insurance recipients in Ontario are receiving premium assistance? Our calculation, based on conversations with officials in the Ministry of Health, is that in the vicinity of 20 per cent of unemployment insurance recipients are getting premium assistance.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, in January there was a total of 1,786,092 policyholders receiving full or partial assistance; on municipal welfare, on which some of those people exist, there are 112,347, and 71,885 are on temporary assistance.

The honourable member knows assistance is based on the gross annual income of the recipient, just as income tax is. If unemployment insurance happens to come along at a time that fills in a trough but still leaves a person with a taxable income in the year, I cannot for the life of me see why he would be any different from a person who had an average annual income of the same total amount and is required to pay those things.

Mr. McClellan: I do not know whether the Treasurer is doing it deliberately, but he is avoiding the question I am asking. I am not talking about senior citizens who get free premium coverage or about welfare recipients, and the Treasurer knows that. I am talking about low-income working people who are not on welfare and about unemployment insurance recipients. Neither of these groups is covered by his flimsy and flaccid premium assistance program.

Why does the Treasurer continue to dodge this question? Why does he not acknowledge that there are tens of thousands of low-income working people and tens of thousands of unemployment insurance recipients in Ontario who are ineligible for premium assistance and who face the crushing burden of \$680 a year in OHIP premiums? When is he going to scrap this useless premium assistance program and replace it with a tax credit?

Hon. F. S. Miller: About 900,000 policyholders who are under 65 do not think it so useless.

Less than 20 per cent of the health care system is paid for by it.

I do not know what kind of world the member thinks exists out there where \$7.5 billion can be spent on health care and only \$1.5 billion—

Mr. R. F. Johnston: What are the other provinces doing? This is just so much garbage.

The Acting Speaker: Order.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Every time the honourable member starts losing he starts yacking.

Ms. Copps: Mr. Speaker, if the Treasurer looks at his 1982 budget and this one, it is clear from his figures in this budget that more than 2,000 families who were eligible for premium assistance in 1981 are no longer eligible. If he were to take a look at the economic climate in 1983, he might think people are more in need. With a sense of fair play, could he not introduce an increase in the premium assistance level at least to cover those families who were covered in 1981?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, in my response to the original question I said we would review it each year, and we did so this year. The five per cent increase in OHIP premiums is less than inflation. I think the honourable member will accept that. It is also about 12 per cent less than the increase in the cost of the health care system last year, as I recall it. It did not even continue to maintain OHIP at the level it previously did.

I suggest to the member that each year we will continue that threshold level at which we cut in with assistance. It will be done next year again.

BUDGET SECURITY

Mr. Pollock: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Solicitor General. Last week, we were discussing at this time the alleged budget leaks and it was reported in one local paper that a reporter from the Globe and Mail allegedly had taken documents from a Toronto printing firm. Did that reporter take that information from the premises of a printing firm?

Mr. Wildman: Did you just hear about that?

Mr. Peterson: When did you find out about it?
11 a.m.

Hon. G. W. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure I heard the last part of the honourable member's question. Could he repeat it?

Mr. Pollock: Did that reporter take information from that Toronto printing firm?

Hon. G. W. Taylor: I thought I heard that, but I was not sure.

Mr. Peterson: George, don't start thinking about it; you'll get in trouble. Just read what you have in front of you.

The Acting Speaker: Order.

Hon. G. W. Taylor: I am very interested in the member's question. It is a very good one. I am not sure the content and the facts are totally as I would like to answer them.

A police investigation into this matter is proceeding. As all members know, as one is doing an investigation on this matter, it is not the process and the procedure of the Solicitor General to comment on the investigation. I will just assure the honourable members that the investigation is proceeding. When there is a culmination of that investigation, we will follow the normal procedure of consulting with the law officers of the crown and come to some conclusion.

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, when does the Solicitor General expect his investigation will be concluded? Does he have any indication?

Hon. G. W. Taylor: No, Mr. Speaker, I have no indication to give this House as to when the investigation will be completed. Naturally, it will be a thorough, comprehensive, total investigation and when the matter is completed, I shall inform the members. I do not have a time frame for that now.

FARM ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Mr. Riddell: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture and Food. I thought the minister would be attending the Centralia College graduation today. I hope the announcement by the Premier (Mr. Davis) has not dampened his spirits, because I still think the minister is the front runner.

My question pertains to the shortcomings of the budget as it affects the agricultural industry. In view of the fact that the amount spent to date under the Ontario farm adjustment assistance program, commonly referred to as OFAAP, is \$18.8 million out of a total allocation of \$80 million, and since falling interest rates have made the five per cent subsidy portion of the program practically useless to farmers and figures in the budget state that \$20 million of this program was underspent in 1982-83 and transferred to the following year, why does the minister not change this program as the major farm organizations have asked and subsidize the interest rate down to eight per cent from the current 12 per cent?

Will the minister not agree that this change is not likely to put OFAAP over budget, since the present allocation of funds is likely to remain unspent?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to tell the honourable member that my very well-qualified assistant deputy minister, Dr. Clare Rennie, is attending the graduation at Centralia today. I checked first to see whether the local member was going to attend, and I figured if it was not important enough for him to be there—

Mr. Riddell: I'll be there. As soon as you answer my question, I am gone.

Mr. Peterson: Would you like him to drive you down in his car, Dennis?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: No. Yours.

Mr. Wrye: Come on. Get on with it and answer the question.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Do you want a long answer?

Interjections.

The Acting Speaker: The minister will answer the question.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: As the member knows, when the farm adjustment assistance program was developed in late 1981 by a task force embracing government and industry representation and when it was introduced in 1982, it was originally intended to be a short-term program, in fact, only a one-year program. At the time it was developed the primary concern to be addressed was to be that of very high interest rates and, as a result, in 1982, through both the initial announcement of the program and the broadened criteria that I announced in this House on March 11 last year, we were able to assist something like 3,500 people, most of whom applied for interest rate reduction grants.

As 1982 wore on, the interest rates came down, so this was not as much of a problem. It had been the view of the task force and, I think, the widely held view of the industry in late 1981 or early 1982 that a 12 per cent interest rate was a tolerable level with which to work. It was not ideal, obviously; we would all like to see it lower than that, whether we are farmers, residential mortgage holders or whatever.

But as the rates came down there were still problems, particularly with respect to certain commodity prices, some of which had not improved any from 1981 and others of which deteriorated in 1982. I am thinking particularly of the cash crops.

So the program was extended and at the time I announced the extension of the program I indicated we fully anticipated that, with interest rates having come down, option B, as it is known in the program, would be a less attractive feature—it would be useful to some, but not to nearly as many as in 1982—but option C, under which the government provides guarantees of new lines of operating credit, would be used more extensively in 1983. In fact, it is option C that is being requested more often this year. The intention is that the program will terminate on December 31, 1983.

With respect, I think what the honourable member is talking about is a suggestion, which is certainly advanced by some people, that the government should have a program that permanently subsidizes interest rates below current levels. We do not have any plans to do that.

Mr. Riddell: If the minister had ever tried his hand at farming, he would know that one cannot produce at any kind of profit with interest rates at 12 per cent. The farmers have no control over their commodity prices—he should know that; therefore, they have to be helped at the other end.

But in view of the total lack of direction given in the budget to the agricultural industry at a time when it is facing its greatest uncertainty, would the minister not agree that his own argument—that we cannot compare this year's decrease in the overall agriculture budget to last year's or even to that of two years ago because of extraordinary expenses for emergency assistance in those years—is a clear indication of the government's failed ad hoc approach to agriculture?

The minister cannot use the \$45 million he put into the tobacco crop last year because he knows that \$15 million of that is federal money and the other \$15 million was put out by way of loans. So he cannot use that bogymen.

Would the minister further agree that Ontario farmers cannot hope to survive if they are left to plan on a year-to-year basis without focus? Why does the minister not act on the recommendation of the government's action committee in 1981, which included his own deputy minister and which stated that the provincial government should implement a long-term strategy for agriculture? When will we see that kind of strategy?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I take it that, if I were to put a resolution before this House supporting the government's initiatives with respect to the development of a national stabilization pro-

gram, the member would second it and would say to his colleague, his friend in Ottawa: "Get off the pot. Work with the provinces; work with the producers; stop talking about some better idea that you have never presented."

The fact is that it is this ministry and this government that have taken a leadership position in respect of several important initiatives in agriculture in this country, not the least of them being stabilization, and I am sure the member would support what we are doing 100 per cent because that is in the long-term interests of agriculture.

The Acting Speaker: Supplementary, member for Welland-Thorold.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Do you support the resolution?

Mr. Riddell: You know I support it.

The Acting Speaker: Order.

Interjections.

11:10 a.m.

The Acting Speaker: The Minister of Agriculture and Food has stirred the pot. The member for Welland-Thorold.

Mr. Swart: Mr. Speaker, when I questioned the minister during estimates last year on how much additional money the province would be willing to put into this three-part program, he intimated he did not expect there would be any additional money required. What good is it going to be to the farmers if no more money is put in by the government? He is just using this program as a red herring.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: I suggest the member examines the record of what we discussed during estimates, and the record of anything I have ever said in public on that question.

Mr. Laughren: Answer the question. It is not a point of order.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I am sure the member will find I have said repeatedly that compared to the ad hoc approach, which in my view has characterized support among all the provinces in recent years because of the insufficiency of the existing Agricultural Stabilization Act of Canada, the cost to governments will be little more, if any, than what it has cost us with the ad hoc approach. It will cost more than a base budget, but not in comparison to ad hocking our way through.

Mr. Wildman: That is the answer to the question.

Mr. R. F. Johnston: That is not a point of order.

The Acting Speaker: I would ask the member for Welland-Thorold to clarify his supplementary question. I am asking him to repeat it so that at least the Speaker can hear it.

Mr. Swart: I have a supplementary question but it should be pointed out to the minister, in reply to his point of order, that his ad hoc program is totally inadequate now and will continue to be totally inadequate in the future.

The Acting Speaker: You are responding to the original question. Do you have a supplementary?

Mr. Swart: Is the minister aware the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) stated in his comments that the programs in force would be continued with something like a 9.3 per cent increase this year? Will he, therefore, give a guarantee to this House that there will be a 9.3 per cent increase in the \$18 million that was paid out under OFAAP last year? If it is necessary to broaden that program, as should be done, to have a minimum requirement of eight per cent or 10 per cent for the farmers to get assistance, will he change the program so that money is paid out this year?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: There are almost 4,000 farmers in Ontario who are living testaments that OFAAP does work, and that it has provided very meaningful assistance to a number of people. There is sufficient money budgeted that the program will be able to run to the end of 1983 to assist those who meet the criteria of the program. That will not be a problem.

CONSUMER CONFIDENCE

Mr. Cooke: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Treasurer. On page 9 of the budget tabled on Tuesday the Treasurer states, "The pace of our economic recovery will depend a great deal on the strength of consumer demand." With this in mind, I would like to ask the Treasurer, how can he state that his budget has stimulated consumer demand? On the one hand, he gives \$55 million in sales tax breaks, and on the other hand, through the five per cent increase in OHIP premiums, the five per cent surcharge on Ontario taxes and the \$135-million increase in taxes on tobacco and alcohol, a total of \$365 million is taken out of the economy. That is a ratio of \$7 taken out of the economy for every \$1 stimulation of consumer demand. How will this possibly stimulate consumer demand in this province?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, first, my friend assumes all of the consumer demand was in the sales tax package. That is not so. There are other measures that will stimulate consumer demand, not the least of which is our employment package which will get more people back to work, and not the least of which either is the confidence people have in this government because this is a government that has had a good track record.

I think the member will see the taxes we used are either on items like liquor where our tax rate remains considerably lower than in most neighbouring provinces or on income where we have an example of a fairly high savings rate at the present time. The tax that was most likely to affect consumption would have been a sales tax increase. That was deemed to be unwise in the present economy. I hope the member will agree with that.

The small reduction on two selected items has, as far as I can see, been pretty well received by the public. On the few radio shows I have done that are live, phone-in ones, I have found quite a few people have decided to purchase a product made in Ontario. I believe this will create jobs.

Mr. Cooke: The Treasurer points out our tax on tobacco and alcohol in Ontario is much lower than in other provinces. However, for those people on low incomes in Ontario we have the distinction of Ontario health insurance plan premiums that are about double those of either of the two other provinces that charge OHIP premiums. Now we have this five per cent surtax, the so-called social services maintenance tax.

The Acting Speaker: Supplementary?

Mr. Cooke: I am getting to it, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker: Get to it.

Mr. Cooke: Will the Treasurer at least not admit or consider that the five per cent surtax was a mistake? It hits those people on low incomes who are likely to stimulate consumer demand the most because they spend every cent they have. Would he at least go the way the other three provinces—British Columbia, Manitoba and Saskatchewan—have gone with surtax, and charge that tax only on incomes of over \$40,000?

Hon. F. S. Miller: No, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker: There is just over a minute remaining in question period.

Mr. Wrye: Mr. Speaker, in reaching his

decision to offer a short-term stimulus to the furniture and appliance businesses, the Treasurer will be aware he ran entirely counter to the views of the Ontario Chamber of Commerce.

I want to read a portion of its brief to him. The chamber said, "Such a program would serve to reduce inventory rather than to create jobs." Why did the Treasurer reject that advice? Can he tell us, if he believes it is going to create jobs, how many jobs will this short-term stimulus create? It is going to cost the taxpayers \$55 million, about the same amount as the OHIP increase.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I assume the member is against the tax decrease. I assume he is against the people in his riding who will be buying those appliances. I hope he will tell them he opposes that tax decrease. I hope he will tell them he did not believe there should be jobs and that the \$700 million of appliances bought really did not create any jobs in the province.

SIMILARITY OF BILLS

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege: As I said earlier, it was brought to my attention just before I entered the House that the member for Etobicoke (Mr. Philip) stood on a point of order and stated that the Attorney General, among other things, had been guilty of plagiarism with respect to our Bill 32, An Act to amend the Landlord and Tenant Act.

His comments are very interesting. I invite the members of the House to look at the Residential Tenancies Act, Revised Statutes of Ontario 1980, chapter 452, which legislation I believe was passed in 1979. The members will recall there were some sections that were not proclaimed because of a constitutional issue that was raised.

In the honourable member's private member's bill, the two sections are taken directly from this government legislation. I refer all members of the House to subsection 51(2) of that legislation and subsection 52(2) of the same legislation. Also, Bill 32 does contain some important features that are not contained in this private member's bill.

In view of the fact it is quite clear the member for Etobicoke has engaged in plagiarism, of which he has accused the Attorney General, I think he owes both the Attorney General and all the members of this House an apology.

11:20 a.m.

The Acting Speaker: We are not about to

enter into a debate on this matter. You have raised a question of personal privilege. We now come to petitions.

Mr. Philip: On a point of order—

The Acting Speaker: Is this the same point of order?

Mr. Philip: No, on the Attorney General's point of order.

The Acting Speaker: We are not about to enter into a long debate. If the member has a quick point of order different from what has already been raised then he should make it.

Mr. Philip: Mr. Speaker, that section of the legislation which was not proclaimed came from the general government committee and not from the government. If one compares the two bills that are here—

The Acting Speaker: The honourable member has raised—

Mr. Philip: Mr. Speaker, you heard out the Attorney General; the least you can do is hear me out.

The fact is the minister stole my bill. Even an unbiased observer, Orland French, uses the word "steal." He does not say plagiarize, he says the minister stole the bill.

Mr. McClellan: Get one of your lawyers to draft an apology.

Interjections.

The Acting Speaker: Order. The honourable member will take his seat. There is nothing of the order of stealing or anything else. We are here in an honourable House with honourable members. The member asked for a point of clarification. The Attorney General has sought to clarify it further. We are now at the point of petitions.

Mr. Bradley: Mr. Speaker, I have a new point of order. Because he is such a modest individual I would like to point out that the former Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Drea) is a person who could possibly claim credit for this piece of legislation.

The Acting Speaker: I do not think you are leading to a point of order. Please proceed with petitions.

Mr. Riddell: I agree, Mr. Speaker; I must get to this Centralia College graduation.

PETITIONS

MARIPOSA BROOK

Mr. Riddell: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table a

petition containing 171 signatures. It reads as follows:

"We, the undersigned, wish to indicate by signing the within petition that we consider any further drainage works on Mariposa Brook and tributaries to be contrary to our best interests. Our concerns relate to the following: (1) water supply and effects on our water supply and wells; (2) natural features of the area, adverse affect on wetlands, fish and wildlife would be contrary to proposed wetlands policy for the province; (3) cost of any project at difficult economic times with little or no benefit perceived."

CERTIFICATION OF HAIRDRESSERS, BARBERS AND HAIR STYLISTS

Mr. Ruston: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table a petition with 3,200 signatures. They are in support of the certified trade of hairdressers, barbers and hair stylists, and object to the government removing that.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

GRAIN ELEVATOR STORAGE ACT

Hon. Mr. Timbrell moved, seconded by Hon. Mr. McCague, first reading of Bill 40, An Act to revise the Grain Elevator Storage Act.

Motion agreed to.

DEGREE GRANTING ACT

Hon. Miss Stephenson moved, seconded by Hon. Mr. Wells, first reading of Bill 41, An Act to regulate the Granting of Degrees.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, in reintroducing this bill entitled An Act to regulate the Granting of Degrees I would note that there are some changes in the wording of the bill but it is essentially the same one I introduced last year.

My conviction regarding the absolute need for this legislation was reinforced earlier this week and again this morning by the United States Federal Bureau of Investigation's announcement that it is investigating a number of mail order colleges for allegedly issuing phoney degrees. Some of these institutions—in fact, four of them—are operating from post office boxes in Ontario.

Mr. Laughren: Do they supply the law degrees to Osgoode Hall?

Hon. Miss Stephenson: The majority of provinces in this country have at this time some form

of legislative control over the granting of degrees or the use of the term "university." The absence of legislative control in Ontario constitutes a significant exception, and the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada is concerned that the universal acceptance of the Canadian university degree will be jeopardized by the absence of appropriate provincial legislation in this province. The association, AUCC, has urged that this bill be enacted as soon as possible.

Mr. Laughren: Even Richard Treleaven has a law degree. Can you imagine?

ORDERS OF THE DAY

BUDGET DEBATE

(continued)

Resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion that this House approves in general the budgetary policy of the government.

Mr. Treleaven: Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to rise to speak in favour of the budget. First, this pile of Revised Statutes of Ontario really is not to be referred to, it is simply to help out my bifocals.

In reply to the interjections made by the member for Nickel Belt as the Minister of Education introduced her bill, I do not think Osgoode Hall will be unduly affected by that bill. I think most solicitors who received their call to the bar from Osgoode Hall and their legal training there are safe and their degrees and their calls will stay in place.

This budget not only exemplifies responsible financial management but also provides for direct job creation and other stimulative measures at a time when they are needed. I am sure there were many temptations facing the Treasurer in the preparation of the budget, and just as many pitfalls. Fortunately for us, he was able to avoid them. It would no doubt have been easy to invent all sorts of schemes for creating jobs in the public sector, and it appears the third party has done just that, but well-intentioned as such ideas might have been they would have been irresponsible.

The other morning as I was travelling along the highway to the riding of Oxford I had the pleasure of hearing the two opposition critics interviewed on the Canadian Broadcasting Corp. Each of them was hard pressed. They were like the little boy who, on the television commercial, comes up with an empty bowl and asks for more.

Their approach was less than credible. Both

the Liberal and the NDP critics were asking for more goodies, asking for the government to provide more services. However, they did not state on the radio whether they wanted a larger deficit or more taxes. I submit that when one is suggesting more services must be provided, it is only credible and reasonable and mature to suggest where the money is going to come from: a larger deficit or more tax.

I will get to the comments that were made last night by the member for Algoma (Mr. Wildman). He did face the issue, but the two critics did not. If one wants services, it is only credible to fess up to what one is going to tax; to stand right in front of the public and say, "I am going to tax A, B, or C." Do not hide behind just "more" and duck the issues.

11:30 a.m.

Last night the member for Algoma did stand more credibly than his party's critic. He did say he wanted to raise \$2 billion more for job creation, \$1 billion of which he wanted to raise by an increased deficit. I will deal with deficits later in my remarks.

He was also going to raise \$1 billion through the reinstitution of succession duties and through corporation taxes. If I may review the history of succession duties in Ontario, in fact in Canada, both the federal and provincial governments got out of the field of death duties because, quite frankly, they were not raising enough taxes. The federal government got out and instituted capital gains in 1971 and the province got out of succession duties after that.

I was not a member of this House, but I was a solicitor with a major part of my practice in estates. I was certainly aware of death duties; a good part of my day was spent in estate planning dealing with succession duties, something I am sure the Speaker in the chair was also doing.

There is no possible way that \$750 million is going to be raised by the reinstitution of succession duties in Ontario.

Mr. Laughren: Do not mislead the House; \$100 million.

Mr. Treleaven: The member for Algoma was suggesting that last night. The member for Nickel Belt is now suggesting it was \$100 million in succession duties. Does that mean, therefore, that the other \$900 million was to be an increase in corporation taxes, because the member for Algoma was going to raise his \$1 billion by those two means?

Mr. Laughren: Why does the member not pay attention?

Mr. Treleaven: I thought I was paying attention. I suspect the member for Nickel Belt was not listening properly to his friend. He was in anticipatory high dudgeon for the member for Scarborough West (Mr. R. F. Johnston) and his late show. I suspect he was distracted from the matter of death duties.

Getting back to the budget per se, huge expenditures without matching revenues never serve the public interest and such expenditures by government would only slow down the recovery which has just begun.

Of course, there really have not been many other serious suggestions made that differ much from the approach taken by the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) in his budget. That approach has been an eminently sensible one.

The budget which the Treasurer presented illustrates a number of points. It illustrates the government has Ontario's economic prosperity and future health in mind and is not willing to sacrifice those for short-term gains. The budget also illustrates the concern of this government for those individuals who do not have jobs. I will get to that a little later.

In addition to its other programs, special provisions have been made for youth employment: a spending increase of more than 30 per cent over last year's budget figures.

Mr. Gillies: Hear, hear.

Mr. Treleaven: Yes, and certainly the member for Brantford last night extolled that move. Youth employment is his area and I am sure he convinced the member for Nickel Belt of the additional jobs that are forthcoming in the youth area.

These provisions, according to the budget presentation, are expected to create over 100,000 jobs for our youth. We should not forget as well that the other job creation and manpower training measures will also help many young people in that 15 to 24 age group.

Third, this budget clearly illustrates the government's commitment to our economic and social programs. Rather than chopping back on programs in a time of economic adversity, these programs are being maintained and will be sustained, partly by the social services maintenance tax which is also mentioned in the budget. Might I say it is also temporary.

In addition to normal ongoing processes to improve our programs, the government has moved to establish a formal program review process. I think we are all in agreement privately, if not publicly, that the best way to improve government programs is to ensure they work

better rather than using the socialist solution of throwing someone else's money at them.

It is my hope the program review process will be successful. Not only will its success be of help in the near future where spending flexibility will continue to be limited, but the lessons learned from this process will be with us for a good many years. We will therefore be able to allocate our resources wisely for various measures and at the same time reduce our provincial deficit.

The word "deficit" is used by all and sundry in this House and in the newspapers. I suspect a good many people who are not very attuned to our political meanderings in the county of Oxford and many other ridings need to focus on the word. In Oxford county deficit means debt, it means the borrowing of money.

The New Democratic Party critic on that same radio interview last Wednesday morning was attempting to castigate this government because Ontario has the lowest per capita deficit in Canada, not only per capita but also according to gross provincial product. He was stating this and implying it was bad that we had the lowest deficit. Even though I cannot speak for the people in other ridings, I believe the people of Oxford still have their feet on the ground sufficiently to understand that debt is not inherently good. Debt is something to be kept away from.

Mr. Cassidy: What about unemployment? Is unemployment fine?

Mr. Treleaven: Unemployment is not what we are dealing with. Let us stay on one subject at a time.

Debt is not inherently good. Borrowing money is not something one chases after. It is a necessary evil but it is not good in itself. Deficits are not good in themselves. Oxford county common sense says that. Perhaps socialist philosophy has lost sight of what the average person in Ontario understands as debt and borrowing of money.

I realize that Ontario with its deficit comes across very well compared with other jurisdictions in this country; but while it might be tempting to leave it at that we should consider how serious things are in other jurisdictions rather than how well things are here. One had only to listen to the news last night and read the newspapers this morning about the difficulties in our adjacent jurisdictions to see the comparison as to how well, relatively speaking, things are going in Ontario.

Whether some members on the other side like it or not, we must start making plans to elimi-

nate that section of the Treasurer's chart that shows 11 cents of every expenditure dollar being spent on interest. The great majority of the farmers in difficulty today have interest rates as a primary concern and a primary reason for their problems. The second problem is poor prices for their products.

I referred to the 11 per cent of the budget being spent on interest. The benefits of dealing with this 11 per cent interest rate are obvious. They have been discussed both inside and outside the chamber for years. Nevertheless, every time I look at the pie chart at the back of the budget I cannot help wondering what we could do if that money was freed up and available for other uses. One could look at the pie the federal government has and only dream of what could be done with those funds, the 30 or 40 per cent interest charges or carrying charges which we and future generations are going to carry.

The possibility of fewer and lower taxes in the future is there but we have to start planning for it now.

11:40 a.m.

The Treasurer's statement included the phrase "sound financial stewardship." All members on this side of the House certainly agree with that. The newspapers have given us many words such as "reasonable" and "moderate." The chambers of commerce in the county of Oxford have called it that. It is certainly an endorsement when the local chambers of commerce support their local Tory government.

Any administration that can ensure revenues and expenditures over a year-long period will remain within 0.7 per cent of original budget estimates is demonstrating its understanding and ability to control the revenue and expenditure process. It also is demonstrating an ability to react in a flexible manner to changing situations.

I am particularly happy this government will be providing assistance to beginning farmers. High startup costs mean virtually everyone interested in going into farming must borrow money. The high interest rates of recent years have probably been the greatest factor behind farm bankruptcies, though high production costs combined with low returns have also caused difficulties.

For those already in the business with financially viable operations, the Ontario farm adjustment assistance program has been able to help. I will refer to that as OFAAP in the rest of my remarks.

In view of the continuing financial difficulties facing farmers, the government extended OFAAP for an additional year in December. Yesterday in his budget address the Liberal critic referred to the criteria of OFAAP. He wanted those extended. Then in the balance of his remarks he implied that he wanted the equity base to go from 10 per cent to zero per cent.

I wish to address the upper limits of the equity—the 60 per cent. I would hope the government could find its way clear to increase the 60 per cent equity. Several farmers in Oxford county with equities well over 60 per cent have been and are, as of this day, in severe trouble. In an average farm in Oxford county with perhaps 100 to 150 acres, a normal barn, a normal low-moisture silo, a normal range of implements, equipment and animals, there is certainly \$500,000 or \$600,000 involved. If a person had 66 or 67 per cent equity it would still mean he is in debt for more than \$200,000.

In the ordinary types of farming it is very difficult for a person on that 100-plus acres farm to carry charges of \$200,000 plus. Depending on interest rates we are talking about \$25,000 or \$30,000 a year in carrying charges.

Many farmers are in difficulty. Yesterday I was in touch with the Farm Credit Corp. trying to obtain assistance for a man who has had a farm for 10 years and whose equity is certainly well above 60 per cent—probably about 70 per cent. However, with simple economic facts of life such as cash flow and decreases in the rent per acre cash croppers are willing to pay, it appears this man, in ploughing all his money back into his farm and getting systematic tileage done, is going to lose it. He simply cannot raise funds. Yet he does not qualify for OFAAP assistance.

I would like to see this government give first priority to increasing the top end of that 60 per cent equity figure rather than reacting to the lower side. I think it certainly should give the upper side the priority.

With the Treasurer's budget statement, we can now begin to look forward to assistance for beginner farmers. I am glad financial resources could be found for this program, given the current revenue-expenditure situation. I am very much looking forward to the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Timbrell) providing us with the particulars of these programs.

From the details made available in the budget statement, the subsidy of up to five percentage points of interest on eligible loans for a five-year period will be of considerable assistance to

beginning farmers. Because the importance of agriculture is not reflected in the number of producers involved, the potential of helping as many as 1,000 new farmers per year is very significant.

As the details are expanded upon by the Minister of Agriculture and Food, I hope they include the family farm situation where a son wishes to buy into the farm on a gradual basis, so that he can get a loan at the bank that will qualify under the criteria of acceptable loans and he can get his interest subsidy on that.

I do not think members will find this program having many people start from scratch and go into farming from nothing with no help from the family. What we will find is that it will accelerate and assist younger members of the family entering into the farming business, probably by way of incorporating the family farm and the purchasing of equity shares, perhaps in excess of the proportion which they get from the bank as a loan.

I do hope it assists this to come about. I have had numerous requests for this over the last several years. In fact, long before I was a member here I dealt with this problem of family planning in the corporate farming sphere and the younger generations attempting to buy in and increase their equity, leaving the older generation with the security they deserve from their many years on the farm. I do hope this new program does assist the family farming unit in itself.

Combined with OFAAP, the Ontario Ministry of Agriculture and Food's other programs and help received through the Board of Industrial Leadership and Development, the results of this program may well contribute to increased food sufficiency and a further reduction of food trade deficit.

One other small area this budget had in it that does not really show up and is not too relevant to most people is the unfairness which we have had in the past to implement dealers. They have been required to carry on their books, as inventory, implements, extremely valuable and expensive machinery with the turnback provision to the manufacturers whereby if it was not sold within a certain length of time it could be sent back to the manufacturer.

Yet when reporting time came on corporate tax the dealer was required to include that inventory as if it were his, paid for and non-returnable. I believe now the implement dealers get relief up to \$2 million for that inventory on the floor.

It has been a sore point with various implement dealers who have been in touch with me over the last year. I have written to the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Ashe) several times on that and maybe, just maybe, letters from a person in the back bench here have had some little bit of influence on something like this coming about. I would like to think so.

In one other particular area, I was glad to see an additional \$80 million funded into the Canada-Ontario employment development program. My remarks may be a little contrary to some of the remarks we have heard here, even contrary to some of the remarks of the person who assisted me in putting together these written remarks.

If the federal government matches the amount we are putting up in this budget as we did in the original letter of understanding, we will see just under 40,000 additional COED jobs created. Each of us by now has constituents who are benefiting from the COED program. One of its main strengths is that the programs get delivered to individual communities and organizations all across the province.

I have been particularly pleased at the projects undertaken in my own constituency. In Oxford, we have received well over \$2 million under the COED program, well over 200 jobs have been created and they average over six months each. They are not 12, 13 or 14 weeks on the average; they are six months.

11:50 a.m.

About a week ago the latest statistics on unemployment for the Woodstock unemployment office reporting area were reported in the Woodstock-Ingersoll Sentinel Review. It does not include all of the riding or county of Oxford; however, it covers the great majority of it. There was a fall in unemployment. Thirty per cent of that decrease in unemployment was attributable directly to COED and 70 per cent to other factory callbacks.

We have not heard that type of endorsement in this House over the last couple of days. I do want to emphasize that 30 per cent was directly attributable to COED. Even yesterday morning in the town of Ingersoll, one of the larger municipalities of Oxford, a project was announced where COED was putting in \$40,000, which created seven jobs for 118 weeks of work. These are coming along weekly. I do not think the riding of Oxford has failed to have at least one project approved in every weekly bulletin that comes out from COED.

The way COED works and the way it is able to

get people to work is in a large way a tribute to the officials involved. In fact, the reason for that goes back to my earlier comments about the government's good management practices. We all know that one half of the COED program deals with municipalities; and if one of us had gone back earlier and told the average person in the street, certainly in Oxford, that three levels of government, three levels of bureaucracy—municipal, provincial and federal—were getting together to provide for the delivery of a program, then more often than not the average person could have been expected to express some doubts about the program's effectiveness.

In spite of that initial disadvantage, COED has been made to work. It is creating jobs, the earlier problems have been overcome and, even though the paper flow is not as fast as it was under the Ontario employment incentive program created in last year's budget, the joint federal funding has made it possible to create many more jobs.

As I noted earlier, the person who assisted me in forming these remarks and placing them on paper was not as optimistic, nor, obviously, has his information about the good working of this COED program been as much as mine.

I have absolutely nothing but compliments to give to people under the COED program. I find that they are going far beyond the usual bureaucratic degree to assist me in my announcements and to get messages to me early about which municipalities or which clubs are getting projects approved, the number of jobs and the amounts. They have been in the very front line of the bureaucratic endeavours that I have seen over the last two years from my perspective.

In closing, I would like to comment as well on our increased commitment to manpower training. The discussion paper on research and development presented with the budget is also timely and important. While specific details are not yet available, we all realize the importance of and need for a more skilled work force.

Approximately a month ago I had the pleasure of attending a banquet for 70 young people in Oxford county under what we call the Oxford industrial training group. The Minister of Colleges and Universities (Miss Stephenson) was there and was the guest speaker. My predecessor, the then Honourable Harry Parrott, now Harry Parrott of Oxford, was also there and a great evening was had by all.

I understand that other parts of Ontario tend to call this program the community industrial training committee. We in Oxford have had 70

people involved in it. The program is going extremely well. It replaces, may I say, some of the factory experience with classroom experience. This has been funded by this Ontario government. It came to the rescue when the federal government fell down on the job last September.

When it looked as if funding would not come through for this program and the people in the apprenticeship program would not be able to start back at Fanshawe in September, this government came to the rescue, took a chance, provided the immediate funding and said, "Go ahead and we will anticipate the federal government coming in after." It did, but this government is the driving force behind that successful program.

New technologies will bring changes to our work place. I think we are justified in showing concern over what those changes will be. But rather than get carried away in the name of irrational fear, we should also continue to be aware of the job losses which will result if our economy does not keep up with change, and balance this with plain, rural Ontario common sense.

I heard yesterday, and we have heard constantly since I came to this House, reference to a 40-year-old government; then it was 38, now it is 40. That is a red herring. To be correct and true, that would mean all of us over here would have to have sat here for 40 years.

If one looks at the seating plan and checks through the years of first election of the various members to this House, and it is constant through all three parties, one will find that approximately one third of the members were elected in 1981, one third were elected in 1975 or 1977 and only one third of the members were here prior to 1975. That means this is a young government. This is a young group; I will not say it is an inexperienced group, I will say it is a young group.

It is not a 40-year-old government. The average says it is about a five-year-old government. Mr. Speaker, I intend to hoot and holler as much as you will permit each time I hear this "40-year-old government" term in the House over the next several years.

In ending, I think our budget places Ontario in a good position to take advantage of the coming economic recovery. I would like to congratulate the Treasurer on the presentation of a sound, reasonable, responsible, sensible and moderate document of which we and all Ontarians can be proud.

The Deputy Speaker: I thank the member for Oxford for his remarks. At this time I would like to recognize the member for Parkdale.

Mr. R. F. Johnston: Do you have to?

Mr. Ruprecht: Mr. Speaker, I am indeed happy to participate in this debate. I would like to divide my presentation into two aspects: one, the budget as a whole in its overall aspect, and two, specifically what it means for the residents of Parkdale riding.

Undoubtedly every member of the House, including the member for Scarborough West (Mr. R. F. Johnston), even the member for Bellwoods (Mr. McClellan) and even the member for High Park-Swansea (Mr. Shymko), knows this budget affects every person in Ontario. That is why it is so crucial.

Mr. Shymko: Very positive.

[Applause]

Mr. Ruprecht: I only wish I could applaud this particular budget. I wish we could say something very positive about this budget, but let me say this budget in its overall design lacks one thing; it lacks vision.

It lacks vision because a budget is a response by the government to introduce new and imaginative programs. This budget does not do that. A budget is also supposed to indicate which way this province is going to move in the future. This budget says nothing about the future of Ontario, about which way the province is going to move or which way we want our children, who are our future, to move.

12 noon

There are various ways a government can persuade a population. Moral suasion is one way, but that is lacking in this government. Just think about the Rosenberg fiasco. How can this government, with this budget, try to persuade the people of Ontario to follow a new program when behind this persuasion people have to think what happened to Morley Rosenberg? What is the moral authority of this government to persuade the public of Ontario when they have to think about those kinds of decisions?

What is the moral persuasion of this government when we see no consistency—

Mr. Laughren: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: I appreciate that you recognized me in the middle of that stirring address. I want to know whether you can find out for us, as a point of information, whether it was Morley or Lennie Rosenberg who was at David Peterson's fund-raising dinner in Toronto.

The Deputy Speaker: That is not a point of order or of privilege.

Mr. Ruprecht: Mr. Speaker, I am simply saying this budget really goes nowhere in leading the people of Ontario towards a new horizon; in showing where we should go for the future. I do not want to condemn the government too much. It does some things right occasionally. A blind chicken finds a kernel of corn occasionally, and that is how the government occasionally does something right: blindly falling over something.

Mr. Shymko: At least we are not turkeys.

Mr. Ruprecht: But I do not want to talk about blind chickens or blind turkeys or blind Tories who occasionally do good things. I want to talk about the future of Ontario and how this budget does nothing to provide new programs or a new vision for Ontario. It simply plods along with no imagination and creates a feeling of uncertainty about the future among Ontario residents.

How can anyone plan his or her future or the future of the children if the uncertainty of these budget proposals continues? There is no long-term strategy here. I would like any member of the government to tell me where its long-term economic strategy is for Ontario. The answer is silence, just as I expected it to be. This budgetary document says absolutely nothing about the future of Ontario and how its citizens are to develop and show themselves and in which way they can tell their children to go.

One way this government has an influence over the people of Ontario, one way it can indicate to people which way they can go and what they can expect in the future, is through a budget statement. A budget is an economic statement about the future of Ontario. But there is absolutely nothing in here that talks about a strategy or a vision of the future. That is a problem we all have to think about.

People come into my constituency office and say, "Above everything else, Tony, we need a job." They need jobs. When we look at this budget and at the job creation programs it is supposed to talk about—of course, we on this side of the House think there is a total lack of any new imaginative policies and programs to create jobs—we can only sadly conclude that again there is no thought given to the future of Ontario.

What the people of Ontario want is to work. So let them work. Let us work together and let us build. This budget and this government do not let the people of Ontario build and create

for the future. That is part of the problem of this budget.

The people who come to my office say: "Provide jobs. Create employment. Do something, but let our kids work." They are 18, 19, 20, 21 years old. They come to my office and they say, "We have looked out there for weeks and we cannot find anything." It is no excuse at all simply to say, as I hear many members say, that all people have to do, if they really want a job, is find a job.

The sad fact is that there are no jobs. So the whole argument in saying, "Let these people find jobs; some of them are not trying hard enough and some of them are really lazy" is a bogymen and a straw man. The people of Ontario, I am confident, want to work. The people of Ontario want to build. I am sure your own constituents, Mr. Speaker, come to you with the same problem and say: "Let us get on with the business of the future. Let us get on with finding employment for our children."

What is the answer of members on the other side of the House when they go to their constituency offices and they are asked those questions? Perhaps the answer is, as my friend the member for Bellwoods indicated, that there might be a job for those who go and see members of the government party. Perhaps I should ask that question, because one person might know another person. I hope that is not the case.

Mr. McClellan: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker: I did not indicate that. Let the record show I did not say government members can find anybody a job.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Cousens): That was not much of a point. Carry on.

Mr. Ruprecht: That is right, Mr. Speaker.

In any case, I am simply saying the people of Ontario are coming to all of us and saying, "Please, give us something; Give us work," and we cannot find it for them. Where are we going to send them? Do we send them to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Ramsay)? He cannot provide jobs. Do we send them to the Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Drea)? He cannot find jobs.

Mr. Hodgson: I can find them jobs in agriculture.

Mr. Ruprecht: Do we send them to the member for York North (Mr. Hodgson)? Can he find jobs for them out there?

Mr. Hodgson: There is work there.

Mr. Ruprecht: Okay. We will send them to him.

That is precisely what I indicated earlier. I have stood here and said they are going to come up with a straw man, and there is the response. The response of the government is, "If the people want to work, we can find them jobs." I challenge them to come to my office. I can give them hundreds of people in Parkdale who want work and who cannot find it. They go to the employment and manpower offices. They cannot produce jobs over there. The member for York North is saying that if they want jobs they can go to him and he can provide them. I will send him the people.

Mr. Hodgson: In agriculture I can provide the jobs.

The Acting Speaker: Order.

Mr. Ruprecht: That is a real straw man. That is precisely the kind of Neanderthal thinking I would not expect the member to use. As I had said earlier, some people indicate there are jobs when really there are none.

With this budget the government has squandered our resources and consequently has squandered the future of Ontario. How has it done that? It is so serious that this government has spent more than \$300 million on the Suncor purchase, which is the antithesis of Progressive Conservative Party philosophy. They are even inconsistent with their own political party. How can we ask them to be consistent with the people of Ontario when they cannot even be consistent with their own party philosophy? I say to the members, "Shame."

12:10 p.m.

Not only are they squandering our resources by spending more than \$300 million for a Suncor purchase, but also they have tried to squander our resources, millions of them, to buy the Premier (Mr. Davis) a jet.

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mr. Ruprecht: Had it not been for the opposition members here, had it not been for the strong opposition on this side of the House, the Premier today would have had his jet and he would have squandered more than \$20 million or \$23 million on that item alone. But through our conscience and the activities we have produced on this side of the House, we stopped the Premier from purchasing his jet and consequently prevented this province from squandering many more millions, as this government wanted to do. Consequently, we should stand

here and condemn them for wanting to spend even more money.

They have squandered millions of dollars in advertising. What has this advertising done to create jobs? This government spends millions of dollars every year with its friends, advertising its own programs, which are the old trodden-path programs we have seen in the past. I am thinking specifically of the Board of Industrial Leadership and Development program, which produces nothing new; it is simply a rehash, a warming-over of the old omelettes of economic stagnation and economic unproductivity.

We on this side of the House would have funnelled the resources that the government has squandered in such purchases as I have indicated—not only on the purchase of Suncor but also on the jet and the millions in government advertising—into establishing a productivity centre and employment growth; and, of course, that should be jointly operated.

That is what we would have done. Make no mistake, Mr. Speaker, we would have established an industrial research assistance program for small and medium-sized businesses. With the money to create jobs alone we would have created a program to increase joint university and industry research and technological efforts.

With the money that was squandered we would have conducted research in telecommunications, space technology and computer sciences. With the money that was squandered we would have implemented an Ontario biotechnology strategy to improve resource use and industrial development.

With the money that was squandered we would have created a program to establish a university-based, computer-linked microelectronics design network. Just as we would have used this money to build for the vision and the future of this province, we would have taken that money and funnelled it into those kinds of programs that would be future-oriented and would show some imagination.

Above all, the kinds of specific programs I have outlined would have provided for you, Mr. Speaker, for me and for every person in Ontario a vision that a government is concerned about them and about the future of Ontario. Future vision is what is important, and this is what we have sorely neglected and what we see neglected in the budget.

The watchwords here are co-ordination and co-operation. Just as Ontario cannot act alone with these programs, it sometimes should act in co-operation with the other levels of govern-

ment and specifically with the federal government. We must work hand in hand to create programs of this nature within the educational policies in our schools.

Above all, especially on this item, we must never be in a position to import labour. Just as we have imported labour from various countries, especially in the areas of technology and future-oriented issues and programs, we must now work with the Minister of Education (Miss Stephenson) so that we will never again be in a position to import labour.

Since the Minister of Education is here, and I am very happy she is here and listening very attentively, let me say to her that this importation of labour, especially technological labour, is an indictment of the Minister of Education. What it means is that she is found to be sleeping at the switch of the future. Any time we import labour we have an indictment of the minister. It means she has not been future-oriented, and it means this government has not produced educational programs that are future-oriented and can provide jobs.

Think about the anomaly. Think of the inconsistency. On the one hand there are thousands of Ontarians who are unemployed, looking for programs and jobs so their children can create career opportunities and possibilities, and on the other hand we have people going to other countries in the world and saying, "Come to Ontario, because we are inadequately trained; we are not able to find the labour necessary for our own factories."

Mr. Speaker, I know that in your fair-mindedness you would be the first one to admit the blatant incongruity of this kind of a position.

I say to the Minister of Education that, especially when we examine this budget, we see that she is found to be asleep on the future switch of Ontario. We request her to go back to her ministry and immediately provide educational opportunities and programs that will leave no doubt whatsoever about where our children will find jobs in the future and so that we will never be in a position to import labour from other countries, especially the kind of future-oriented labour this government ought to have programs for.

There is no future orientation in this budget. There is not even future orientation in the Ministry of Education. That is an example of how this government, in this budget specifically, does not do the job the people of Ontario are expecting to find so they can think forward for their own future.

Let me touch briefly on some things that are especially important for Toronto and the riding of Parkdale and that could have been addressed through the funnelling of funds into certain ministries, which then would have been more sensitive to the needs of the Metropolitan Toronto ridings.

Since I am more familiar with the city of Toronto than with the other municipalities, I will use that as an example. Many members of Toronto city council came to Queen's Park not too long ago and indicated to us that the province, and specifically the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Mr. Bennett), had made a commitment to Toronto that money would be made available so the city could go ahead to create subsidized housing and build new apartments for people who are in great need.

Mr. Speaker, you will be the first to admit that there are thousands of poor, working-class people on the rolls who have worked all their lives and who, through some accident or some design not of their own, are not able to maintain adequate homes.

12:20 p.m.

The city was made a promise by the ministry that it could go ahead and make some purchases and some commitments to contractors to create this new housing, and that money would become available. Yet when it came down to the crunch, the expectations of some city councillors that money would come forward, specifically for the creation of homes for working-class people and the poor, were not met. When it came to the final crux of putting a name and signature on a contract, that money was not available. Indeed, they could expect a cut.

Not only is that unfair and inconsistent but, when we consider the whole thing, this means short-sightedness in terms of job creation for the future of Ontario. The minister has a beautiful opportunity to create not only short-term employment but also long-term manufacturing gains, because when we create housing, homes and apartment complexes, not only do we create short-term employment in terms of building those apartment houses and complexes but also we gain in the long run in terms of secondary manufacturing.

That is where this government has fallen short in creating housing in those municipalities and metropolitan areas that are suffering because of the low vacancy rate. In most metropolitan areas in Ontario, the vacancy rate is less than one per cent. Imagine that, Mr. Speaker. One

talks about competition and the survival of the fittest; that is what one must talk about when one looks at the vacancy rate, because there is no place one can go once one has been let go.

That brings me to an important item, one I personally fought for. We have not yet received assurances from the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Elgie) that he will see to it that conversion of certain apartments to hotel-like accommodation is going to be stopped. In my own area, as well as in Scarborough, Etobicoke and North York, there are owners of apartments who are saying to tenants: "Here is your notice. You have to move out because we need this accommodation for a change in accommodation status."

What happens is that hundreds of solid tenants—they do not come for one night; they have a yearly contract—are being asked to move so one or two greedy persons can make a giant killing and a giant profit. What they do not know is that when they ask these tenants to move, especially on Jameson Avenue in my riding and in other places, they are not only making a killing in the real sense of the word because they are making a giant profit by upping the rent five or six times, but they are also killing a whole community and the stability of that community, including the school system.

Hundreds of tenants are being asked to move so an owner can change the apartment to hotel-like accommodation that will attract people for one, two or three nights or maybe even as much as a week. The people who come into a neighbourhood for one, two or three nights or in terms of a short-term commitment do not have it in mind to stay for a long time and to make a commitment to the stability of a community, to its school, to its transportation system, to its cleanliness. No commitment is made by people who come into a neighbourhood for one, two or three days to maintain good schools and clean streets.

That is a good indication of what happens to a whole community when this kind of conversion process takes place. Just as I accuse the Minister of Education of sleeping at the switch of future educational programs and possibilities, so must I accuse the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations of sleeping at the switch and destroying community stability.

It is easy to see what will take place in a situation such as that. I, for one, cannot be quiet when my own community is being destroyed. It is not necessarily through malice. That is not the accusation; I am not saying the government is

doing this on purpose and by design. I do not think the Minister of Education or the Minister of Correctional Services (Mr. Leluk)—the only two ministers listening today—would consciously plan to create programs that would hurt the people of Ontario.

They are honourable ministers and their intentions are great, but those ministers are tired. The government is tired, and I would be too if I had been there for 40 years.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Speak for yourself. I am not in any way tired.

Mr. Ruprecht: If the minister had been in the government for 40 years she would be tired and would admit it.

Mr. Ruston: Stale.

Mr. Ruprecht: Tired, stale and unimaginative. Of course, it gets that way after 40 years. Let the fresh winds of change and imagination blow in the direction of creating programs and possibilities for the future of Ontario.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: The fresh winds of change do not encompass the hot air from you.

Mr. Ruprecht: Mr. Speaker, I will disregard the personal remarks, because I know I have been a little critical of the minister, telling her she has been found sleeping. But she has the opportunity either to condemn the budget because it is unimaginative, as I do, or to praise it for whatever good she can find in it.

I would think she would not find very much to praise, since she herself is in the position of not providing educational opportunities for our children. Instead, her government has to go abroad to hire people from other countries. They are doing that—

Hon. Miss Stephenson: To do what?

Mr. Ruprecht: To operate the minister's computers. She hired 20 people just last year to operate her computers. She can check it out. It is a shame. It is her government that went over to find out—

Mr. R. F. Johnston: You never told us this before, Bette.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: He has not yet produced one fact in this House that can be verified.

Mr. Ruprecht: The minister should inform herself of what really takes place in her own government. If she were to do that she might be creating educational programs that are future-oriented and might be teaching our kids the right things. The minister's response is the

typical response of a tired and unimaginative government.

In Parkdale riding, the community is being destroyed because the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations has not plugged this loophole which will prevent some of the owners from destroying a neighbourhood. I leave it at that; I will only say I hope the minister will act soon. There will be hundreds of petitions going through, asking him to stop the possibility of conversions so that a person could not come into a community, raise hell and then leave without making a commitment to that community.

12:30 p.m.

A second point is also important for the Toronto area, especially for the west end of Toronto, and very specifically detrimental to the member for High Park-Swansea (Mr. Shymko).

Mr. Barlow: Get ready for a point of privilege.

Mr. Ruprecht: He can get up on a point of privilege. I think maybe he should if he first of all listens to what I have to say.

Mr. Shymko: Worry about your own riding for a moment.

Mr. Ruprecht: I am very worried about my own riding. I have just stood here and told the government what they ought to do, what programs they ought to institute and where they have been found to be sleeping. There is one more area that should have been addressed in this budget that has not been addressed specifically, and this is why I would say that other ministers are sleeping, too. In fact, I think when we have finished this whole program and when we have finished the budget debate, members might come to the same conclusion: the whole government is sleeping. That is what worries me.

But to get back to the issue specifically, the government has a program that is called deinstitutionalization. This means that because of the new drugs that have come out in the last decade, a person who has been admitted to a mental health centre or a hospital is simply given some of these drugs and within a very short period of time is pushed out of the hospital to wander the streets. Of course, what happens—in my riding, in the ridings of Bellwoods, Dovercourt and High Park-Swansea—is that many of those unfortunate people have to find a place they can call a home, which is really not a home but simply a room they might even have to share with two or three other people.

So the Minister of Health (Mr. Grossman) said last year: "Wait a minute. I hear so much

from the west end of Toronto. I should go down there and have a look, because I want to inform myself personally to see what takes place." I must say, though, that the minister's riding is not very far from the west end; it would be central west in the first place, so he does not have very far to go.

He went in there to try to inform himself of what really takes place. When he came back he was shocked. He said, "By God, the situation there is so terrible that I have to try to do something about it."

Just as I am ready to talk about High Park-Swansea the member seems to be leaving. But now he has changed his mind and is sitting down. That's terrific.

The minister said: "We have to do something. Let's quickly put in some money." What was the result of that? The result was not substantial. But it could have been very substantial if we had had the right programs in this budget, the right financial response to those kinds of needs. We would have been in a much better position to help those unfortunate people; but we are not.

Then, just last week, another minister said: "I have to go down to see what really takes place. I have read so much in newspapers; I have heard so much on the radio; I have heard so much in this Legislature that there is a real, crying need on the part of ex-psychiatric patients and those who are mentally handicapped. I have to go down there to inform myself, to find out personally what takes place in these homes."

Of course, as members know, it was reported widely in the press. In fact, the Toronto Star had a front-page picture of the minister and his assistant. He went into these homes and when he came out he said the same thing as the Minister of Health: "By God, there is a crying need, and we should produce some programs that will help."

We want to find out where the programs and the budget allocations are that will substantially help those people in need. I am not talking about a whitewash; I am not talking about a few cents and a few dollars here and there, scattered widely all over the place. I am speaking about specific programs in a co-ordinated effort between the Ministry of Health and the Ministry of Community and Social Services that is designed directly and significantly—that is the catchword and the key word—to help those kinds of unfortunate people. Co-ordination is what is important.

When we look at page 17 of the budget we see there is now a social services maintenance tax.

Can someone tell me what this social services maintenance tax is? Does it mean the money now collected through this special tax will go into a special fund to help the needy?

I would think so if I were an Ontario resident who was normally informed of what takes place in this province. When I saw "social services maintenance tax," I would think this money I am now being asked to pay would be specifically oriented for those people who are of special concern and who have special needs. Of course, that includes a wide variety of Ontario residents, especially in the metropolitan area I am most familiar with.

There is no such fund. There is no such allocation that will be specifically oriented towards the needy and those who have worked all their lives who are now in great need of some financial incentives and help. The money this minister will be getting from this social services maintenance tax—and it will be in the millions—will not go directly into a special fund to pay for the needy; it will go into the general fund where it can be syphoned off to other kinds of programs.

I for one am very upset that this money which Ontario residents will pay, called the social services maintenance tax, may be used for further purposes and purchases such as Suncor. That is my great concern. If this government were straight with us, it would set up a special fund to help those with special needs. In that case, if we had such a fund, we would not have to go through the charade we must go through when we talk about support services for West Metro Senior Citizens Services.

The Speaker will remember precisely what happened here, as he was in this House; at least I hope he will remember. The Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Drea) was asked when he would support West Metro Senior Citizens Services and when he would help them to establish a program, because the program of West Metro Senior Citizens Services is going down the tube. Beth Hoaster-Walsh, the program director of this specific senior citizens group, told me personally at a luncheon where they tried to raise some funds that if they did not get any help, they would have to fold the supply services to those needy senior citizens whom, at that specific point, they were keeping in their homes.

The reason they were really helped was because a great fuss was being made, because petitions were being handed in to the minister, and because the opposition parties talked to him personally about this specific organization.

I am not sure what would have happened if we had not stood here and questioned him, called him personally, or written letters about it. I know I did. If we had not done that, I do not know what the minister's decision would have been.

That is neither here nor there. What is important is it took so long. It took a great deal of time to convince him to provide the \$15,000 that was necessary to maintain the program to maintain senior citizens in their homes.

Think about the short-sightedness here. On the one hand, we lack hospital beds, and we lack beds and programs for senior citizens who can no longer look after themselves. On the other hand, we cannot provide between \$15,000 and \$30,000 to a senior citizens organization whose goal it is to maintain senior citizens in their homes so they will not be dependent totally on government. There is an incongruity here. On the one hand is the shortage of housing and beds. We cannot look after senior citizens properly when they leave their homes. On the other hand is government insensitivity in throwing them only a few thousand dollars to maintain those programs and projects so that they may have a decent life and will not be a burden to us.

12:40 p.m.

The key word here is "burden." If that money had been withdrawn, here is what would have happened. If \$15,000 had not been forthcoming from the minister, the program that helps hundreds of senior citizens to stay in their homes would have been destroyed. Consequently, hundreds of senior citizens might have ended up on the government's doorstep and on the doorsteps of the hospitals waiting for some services. The taxpayer would have had to pay. I only wish that in this budget the Treasurer had addressed himself more specifically and in more detail to programs that would be effective and proper.

Finally, let me address myself very briefly to another major problem: pollution. I have in front of me a great deal of research that talks about the possibility that the quality of drinking water in Toronto is not what it used to be. When I look at reports in newspapers—and I am looking at the editorial page on February 26, 1983, in the *Toronto Star*, where there is a long article called "The Fear of Dioxin." It says: "Last week we looked at chemicals in the Niagara River. Now we examine the most deadly pollutant of all—dioxin." They examined the water supply.

The issue of pollution is not only addressed in this research report of our drinking water. The

issue of pollution is so vast that it affects life in the lakes; it affects life here, how people live in their homes, how children grow up and the kinds of diseases that might be spreading. The pollution of drinking water is such that it really affects life itself on this planet.

The Minister of the Environment (Mr. Norton), who is well intentioned, tries through his ministry to help out. But what has happened here over the last 20 years? In the Junction triangle area in the west end of Toronto, which is right next to residential homes and where children play, the pressure of criticism has grown so strong and the danger has been so great to people's lives and health that we are seeing at least some steps being taken to try to clean up a bit of the environment.

I am more experienced about the Junction triangle area than the Niagara River. I know, for example, after repeated chemical spills in that area, the health of people has been affected very directly. That is why we have to look at it. We have to see how much has been allocated. We have to see what statements in this budget address the allocation for cleaning up the environment.

When I say we must clean up the environment everywhere, I am speaking fairly broadly. We want to see a much tougher policy, much tougher legislation and a commitment by the Treasurer to supply funds, allocations and programs, which should then be worked out by the Minister of the Environment, and will speak directly to pollution not only in that area—obviously I am very concerned about it—but to pollution everywhere.

As members know, for instance, in the Junction triangle area there have been consistent chemical spills, and toxic substances that have been found are going through the sewer system and are consequently affecting every house on that sewer line. Some members may be asking: "Wait a minute. If a toxic chemical is spilled into the sewer system, how can it possibly get into the homes of the people who are complaining?"

That is a real puzzle, isn't it, because, as members know, before a smell can reach the inside of a home or the inside of a basement, it must go through the safety mechanisms of the sewer pipes. There is a certain amount of water in there, so a smell cannot go directly into a home; it must go through the sewers. Consequently it must go through the water that is there as a safety mechanism. Just like the water that is found in an ordinary washroom, the

water that is found in the elbow of the sewer system should act as a safety mechanism.

The toxic chemicals are so strong—and we have proof of this—that they go right through the water and emerge as bubbles on the other side inside the homes of the people who are being affected. Thus, in this specific way we have chemical spills being directly responsible for the health and safety of every person who has a home on that sewer line, and it goes right through at least two or three ridings that are represented by members here. So it is important that we crack down on those people who are starting to pollute the environment because it is also important for the future.

In one way I am happy that the ministers saw fit, through the co-operation of the ministries of Health, Environment and Labour, to spend \$147,000 on a health study that is supposed to take place in the Junction triangle area. This is one step in the right direction. It shows, at least, that the government is willing to spend this kind of money to find out what the health effects are in that area. Even though when I look at this budget and the policies of this government I cannot find very much good to say about them, in this situation I would say that they have taken one step in the right direction.

I think this step was also probably somewhat initiated not by the ministries I have just mentioned but by the city of Toronto. So even though I did praise them and say, "Yes, you have taken a step in the right direction," let me simply say that the initiative for this kind of program has also not come from the government.

So again, even though some of these steps are correct and fine, the situations I outlined before still stand: namely, that sleepiness is the order of the day and that the initiative, the imagination and the programs of the future have not been addressed in this Legislature by this government.

I would like to see more emphasis in this specific budget on cleaning up our environment, because pollution-related equipment, the cleaning up of the environment, can be a giant business. It can create a lot of jobs. But again, we are not in the forefront of creating the mechanism that will deliver those kinds of pollution-free feeding equipment. We are again found to be on the back burner and we are waiting for the United States and other countries and even other provinces to take the first step. But we want to see the leadership that is essential for the future of Ontario.

12:50 p.m.

In closing, let me simply say—

Some hon. members: Oh, no.

Mr. Ruprecht: Mr. Speaker, I am very flattered members of this Legislature would like me to keep going. That is very interesting. Thank you very much.

Let me then quickly sum up. I said at the beginning of my speech that no specific leadership had been provided by this government. I indicated that leadership was sorely lacking in various fields and what kinds of things we would do if we formed the government.

I indicated there has been no vision whatsoever of the future and no imagination used. There is no major improvement or influence to create jobs and to create confidence in the people of Ontario. I said there was no future for our children with this government and with the programs the government has outlined in this budget. I also indicated we should be creating jobs and that the people of Ontario wanted to build. I said this government has been squandering our resources.

Instead of squandering we expect leadership. We expect the government to produce an industrial strategy in the next budget that will give the people of Ontario confidence, not only in themselves but in the future of this province.

Unless that is done—and it certainly has not been done in this budget—the people of Ontario will lose confidence in this government and I predict they will. After 40 years of floundering, after 40 years of the inactivity that has been shown in this budget, after 40 years of being fairly sleepy I think the people of Ontario will be ready for a change. I personally hope, Mr. Speaker, you will not be involved in the change that takes place, because I think you are sensitive and you do have some sense of leadership.

The Deputy Speaker: Let Hansard show he is speaking to the Deputy Speaker, the member for Durham East (Mr. Cureatz).

Mr. Ruprecht: In fact, I would say there is hope for all of the four members on the government side, because their intentions are probably good. But I am talking about the 70-odd members who are missing—and who probably are not producing the kinds of programs that are necessary.

It is important that the people of Ontario have leadership for the future. If this government

cannot provide the leadership, we are willing, ready and able—in co-operation with others, if that is necessary—to form the government. We can provide the future policies and programs that will re-establish confidence in the people of Ontario. Once this government is gone we can say the people will again have confidence in themselves and we shall build together, we shall grow together and we shall work together. I say let them work.

The Deputy Speaker: First, we would like to thank the member for Parkdale for his comments. I am sure at this point, the member for Oshawa (Mr. Breough) is going to—

Mr. Breough: I know you would not want me to call a quorum, Mr. Speaker.

On motion by Mr. Breough, the debate was adjourned.

The House adjourned at 12:55 p.m.

CONTENTS

Friday, May 13, 1983

Statements by the ministry

Drea, Hon. F., Minister of Community and Social Services:

Developmentally handicapped people 726

Timbrell, Hon. D. R., Minister of Agriculture and Food:

Grain elevator storage bill 727

Wells, Hon. T. L., Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs:

French-language services 727

Oral questions

Miller, Hon. F. S., Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics:

Job creation, Mr. Peterson, Mr. Cooke. 728

Rental housing, Mr. Peterson, Mr. Rae. 729

OHIP premiums, Ms. Copps, Mr. Cooke, Mr. McClellan. 734

Consumer confidence, Mr. Cooke, Mr. Wrye. 738

Norton, Hon. K. C., Minister of the Environment:

Niagara River pollution, Mr. Rae, Mr. Kerrio, Mr. Charlton. 732

Taylor, Hon. G. W., Solicitor General:

Budget security, Mr. Pollock, Mr. Peterson. 736

Timbrell, Hon. D. R., Minister of Agriculture and Food:

Farm adjustment assistance program, Mr. Riddell, Mr. Swart. 736

Petitions

Mariposa Brook, Mr. Riddell, tabled. 740

Certification of hairdressers, barbers and hair stylists, Mr. Ruston, tabled. 740

First readings

Grain Elevator Storage Act, Bill 40, Mr. Timbrell, agreed to. 740

Degree Granting Act, Bill 41, Miss Stephenson, agreed to. 740

Budget debate

Mr. Treleaven. 741

Mr. Ruprecht. 746

Other business

Death of William Goodfellow, Acting Speaker, Mr. Sheppard. 725

Similarity of bills, Mr. Philip. 725

Adjournment debate, Mr. R. F. Johnston, Mr. Laughren, Mr. Drea. 725

Treasurer's wedding anniversary, Mr. Davis. 734

Similarity of bills, Mr. McMurtry, Mr. Philip. 739

Adjournment. 754

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Ashe, Hon. G. L., Minister of Revenue (Durham West PC)
Barlow, W. W. (Cambridge PC)
Bradley, J. J. (St. Catharines L)
Breagh, M. J. (Oshawa NDP)
Cassidy, M. (Ottawa Centre NDP)
Charlton, B. A. (Hamilton Mountain NDP)
Cooke, D. S. (Windsor-Riverside NDP)
Copps, S. M. (Hamilton Centre L)
Cousens, D., Deputy Chairman and Acting Speaker (York Centre PC)
Cureatz, S. L., Deputy Speaker and Chairman (Durham East PC)
Davis, Hon. W. G., Premier (Brampton PC)
Drea, Hon. F., Minister of Community and Social Services (Scarborough Centre PC)
Gillies, P. A. (Brantford PC)
Hodgson, W. (York North PC)
Johnston, R. F. (Scarborough West NDP)
Kerrio, V. G. (Niagara Falls L)
Laughren, F. (Nickel Belt NDP)
McClellan, R. A. (Bellwoods NDP)
McMurtry, Hon. R. R., Attorney General (Eglinton PC)
Miller, Hon. F. S., Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics (Muskoka PC)
Norton, Hon. K. C., Minister of the Environment (Kingston and the Islands PC)
Peterson, D. R. (London Centre L)
Philip, E. T. (Etobicoke NDP)
Pollock, J. (Hastings-Peterborough PC)
Rae, R. K. (York South NDP)
Riddell, J. K. (Huron-Middlesex L)
Rotenberg, D. (Wilson Heights PC)
Ruprecht, T. (Parkdale L)
Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
Sheppard, H. N. (Northumberland PC)
Shymko, Y. R. (High Park-Swansea PC)
Stephenson, Hon. B. M., Minister of Education and Minister of Colleges and Universities (York Mills PC)
Swart, M. L. (Welland-Thorold NDP)
Taylor, Hon. G. W., Solicitor General (Simcoe Centre PC)
Timbrell, Hon. D. R., Minister of Agriculture and Food (Don Mills PC)
Treleven, R. L. (Oxford PC)
Wells, Hon. T. L., Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Scarborough North PC)
Wildman, B. (Algoma NDP)
Wrye, W. M. (Windsor-Sandwich L)



No. 22

Hansard

Official Report of Debates

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Third Session, 32nd Parliament
Monday, May 16, 1983

Speaker: Honourable John M. Turner
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

Published by the Legislative Assembly of Ontario
Editor of Debates: Peter Brannan

CONTENTS

Contents of the proceedings reported in this issue of Hansard appears at the back together with an alphabetical list of the speakers taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is \$15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service Information Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 965-2238.



LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Monday, May 16, 1983

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

OSHAWA GENERALS

Mr. Breagh: Mr. Speaker, I know all honourable members would like to join me in offering congratulations to Canada's number one junior hockey team, the Oshawa Generals. I just wanted to point out that rumour has it they did lose one game someplace in Oregon, but in Oshawa that does not count. This team is the best in the nation. Being from Peterborough, Mr. Speaker, you can attest to that fact.

I wanted to invite all members here to come to Oshawa this afternoon at about 5 p.m. At the Oshawa city hall there will be the beginning of a rather large party. If members do come, they should know that in Oshawa we like to do things right, and this may take some time. We will be back around Thursday or Friday.

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak to that point in that one of the teams Oshawa eliminated along the way was the Sault Ste. Marie Greyhounds, which had finished first in the same league that Oshawa occupies.

But I want to echo the words of the honourable member and say that we should all be extremely proud of the team from Oshawa, particularly so because they had to reach into Sault Ste. Marie to obtain their coach. He is a native of our community.

Mr. Speaker: I am sure we are all very pleased and will extend our congratulations to the players and staff of the Oshawa Generals for doing such a wonderful job.

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY

COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, today I will be reintroducing the bill entitled An Act to amend the Ministry of Colleges and Universities Act, which has been referred to as the university deficits bill.

Since I originally introduced this bill in December 1982, ministry staff have been engaged in discussions with representatives of the universities pertaining to the application of the legislation. I

am pleased to note that we have agreed to a number of changes in the reporting requirements and procedures, which will apply when the bill becomes law, and that these changes are reflected in the policy compendium which is being tabled in conjunction with the bill. Our discussions with the university community with respect to the bill and its applications, however, are continuing.

I would like to reiterate that we are taking legislative action to address the problem of university deficit financing on the basis of advice the government has received from the Ontario Council on University Affairs.

DEATH OF DONALD G. DAVIS

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, it is with regret that I must inform members of the Legislature of the sudden accidental death this morning of Dr. Donald G. Davis, director of the animal industry branch of the Ministry of Agriculture and Food. A native of Huron county and a 1948 graduate of the Ontario Veterinary College, Dr. Davis served his profession and the agricultural industry of this province with dedication and integrity.

He was recently named director of the animal industry branch after having served 10 years as cattle diseases consultant for the province. His career with the ministry spanned 17 years, beginning as a regional veterinarian supervising meat inspection in the west central region in 1966.

His professional accomplishments have included being president of the Ontario Veterinary Association in 1970 and co-author of the Bruce county beef study that investigated feeder cattle diseases and led to greater emphasis on preventive herd health programs.

Dr. Davis also worked closely with the Ontario Veterinary College over the years as a member of several committees, including the curriculum committee for the new doctorate of veterinary medicine program.

In addition to his contributions to his profession, Dr. Davis also generously served his community. From 1952 to 1956 he served as a councillor and mayor of Uxbridge, Ontario,

where he operated a large animal practice for 18 years prior to joining the government.

Dr. Davis enjoyed his leisure time too. He was an avid horseman, but in his characteristic humour he would say the activities he enjoyed most were fishing on Lake Simcoe in the summer and inhabiting hockey arenas in the winter.

I ask that all members join me and all those in the Ministry of Agriculture and Food in expressing sympathy to Dr. Davis's wife, Irene, their five children and their granddaughter.

BUDGET SECURITY

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, in the last few days I have considered long and carefully my responsibilities as Treasurer of the province. I have the greatest respect for parliamentary tradition and I have never tried to avoid my obligations, however difficult they may be. I had decided that, whatever the outcome, my conscience was clear since both I and my staff in Treasury and Economics had taken every reasonable measure including specific contractual agreements to ensure confidentiality.

I have reviewed the legal and constitutional precedents with the solicitors from the Ministry of the Attorney General who are assigned to work with my ministry. I am tabling their memoranda today. They have informed me that the three ingredients which traditionally have required a minister's resignation were not present: first, the minister himself was not in any way responsible; second, all reasonable precautions had been taken; third, no tax measures were involved, prior knowledge of which could have permitted unfair gain.

Regarding the question of ministerial responsibility and accountability in the parliamentary tradition, Mr. Graham Stoodley, QC, after an extensive review of the history, advised as follows: "The rhetoric about resignation is not supported by the facts. Indeed, if the Treasurer were to resign over the issue it would be contrary to the parliamentary tradition evidenced in the Parliaments of Canada and the United Kingdom."

I have discussed the matter with the Premier (Mr. Davis) and we have agreed that, given the facts in this matter, there is no reason for a resignation.

My decision was also affected by the kind support of my colleagues and by so many hundreds of people who have been encouraging—in particular, the media. I plan to remain as

Treasurer of Ontario as long as my Premier requires my services.

2:10 p.m.

ORAL QUESTIONS

FRENCH-LANGUAGE SERVICES

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Education. Is the minister going to respond directly to the requests of a group from Iroquois Falls who are asking that a French-language secondary instructional entity be established there? Has she met the delegations that are at Queen's Park today, and can she tell the House what her response to that request is going to be?

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, I met, informally and I think not entirely by accident, a group of students with M. Serge Plouffe outside the entrance to the east annex on my way into the Legislature this afternoon.

During my absence due to illness, a request was received in my office which was responded to by the arranging of a meeting this morning in my office with the assistant deputy minister responsible for French-language services. That meeting, I believe, did take place; that meeting, having occurred, will of course be reported to me.

The honourable member obviously knows that under current legislation the responsibility for this decision rests primarily with the local board of education. When there is dispute or discomfiture about that decision, the services of the Languages of Instruction Commission of Ontario may be requested.

That has been done. The LIC has made a recommendation that has not at this point been accepted by the board responsible in that area but it is my understanding that there is a significant number of citizens within the area who are attempting to provide an equitable and reasonable solution to the difficulty which apparently lies in that area at this point.

The member also knows we had made a proposal about four weeks ago regarding a modification of the responses to the languages of instruction commission, which, if accepted, could be introduced as legislation as early as this spring. We are considering that modification right now.

Mr. Nixon: We are all aware that these decisions do not come readily or easily; but with the reference that the minister has made to the announcement about four weeks ago, which certainly captured the attention of people right

across Canada, that Ontario was prepared to provide French-language education for each individual who was basically a French-language student, surely the minister is in a position to indicate to the House now what her intention is in this regard, whether the appropriate legislation will be forthcoming and what we as members of this House can expect during the remainder of this session to come to grips with the problem.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: As I said, the proposal has been widely announced. It would appear to have received reasonable support, and we are in the process of drafting legislation right at this point, which must, of course, proceed through the usual processes before it can come to the House. That has not been completed as yet. I do not think it is going to take very long, I am sure the honourable members will see the results of it in the not very distant future.

I would remind the honourable member that the proposal specifically, as introduced four weeks ago, ensures that instruction is available for children within this province in either English or French where those children are in a minority. It is not limited only, as I am sure the member realizes, to francophone education; it also applies to anglophone education.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, is the minister aware that, because of illness, Mr. Kipp did not meet with the students from Iroquois Falls this morning? My understanding is that therefore they have not been able to have official contact with the ministry.

Given this situation, will the minister agree to meet with these students, who travelled for eight hours in a yellow school bus yesterday in order to meet with the legislators of the province because of their desire to see the creation of a French-language entity at the Iroquois Falls high school?

Will the minister also agree that ministry officials will go to Iroquois Falls to explain to the community, which is very confused, just what an entity would involve and how an entity can be introduced into the community without the disruption that some people in the area feel?

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, in response to the final question of the honourable member first, may I say that the representatives of the regional office have already done that significantly within that area and will continue to do so.

It is my understanding there was a problem this morning with the meeting which had been

arranged with the assistant deputy minister and it has been postponed until this afternoon, I believe, at 3:30 p.m., and will be with senior officials of the ministry.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, this minister will recall her own immortal words of October 5, 1979, when she said her government took it as a matter of principle to offer, wherever numbers or other circumstances warranted, French-language entities. Would the minister not admit that program has been and will continue to be a failure until she gives quasi-judicial status to the languages of instruction commission so the decisions can then be implemented properly instead of being a popularity contest? This will be the case even with her new white paper, assuming that it is ever approved.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, unlike the member for Prescott-Russell (Mr. Boudria), I have no presumption that my words are immortal at any time.

Mr. Wrye: That is about the only thing we would agree with you on.

Mr. McClellan: Simply infallible.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: The minister certainly is not immortal.

The content of that statement of October 5, 1979, was a very important statement on the part of this government. It is a statement which has been carried forward and has been successful in a significant number of areas the honourable member, of course, deliberately chooses to ignore. There are some areas in which there are difficulties and we have been continuing to try to find solutions to those difficult situations.

There is no policy in this government in the area of instruction or education which is totally static, nor should it be, because it is a progressive kind of activity and we continue to be progressive in our attempts to solve the problems associated with it.

MINAKI LODGE

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Tourism and Recreation, dealing with his publication entitled, *Your Complete Travel Guide to All the Places Where the World Comes to Play*, which was perhaps even in the Peterborough Examiner over the weekend and in the Brantford Expositor and in all the other dailies in this province and in many American publications as well. It contains not only the minister's name but of course the Premier's (Mr. Davis) name—but not his pic-

ture, unless he is in one of the crowd scenes at Ontario Place.

My question to the minister is how could he have undertaken the publication of this with the approval of the Premier himself, when the only reference to Minaki is on page 45? This is the only reference at all and it says Minaki is "a small picturesque village situated on the Winnipeg River." There is no reference whatsoever to the Taj Mahal that has been built in honour of the minister and his colleagues.

How could he possibly have overlooked an investment of \$45 million? He is expecting to entice American and Canadian guests there and perhaps to pay at least part of the overdue interest on that establishment, yet he does not advertise this in his major publication.

Hon. Mr. Baetz: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased the acting Leader of the Opposition raises the question about this highly successful encyclopaedia. I am glad to hear he recognizes it is a very highly successful publication. In fact we do distribute it to over eight million households in Ontario and in our neighbouring states. It is a very popular and effective publication.

Mr. Kerrio: Minaki will never pay.

Hon. Mr. Baetz: Will the member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Kerrio) hold it; Niagara Falls is mentioned.

There is a very simple explanation to the question the member has raised which is that, as he goes through it, he will note we do not advertise individual lodges, hotels, motels and so on. In fairness to the private sector, which constitutes the background of our whole tourism inventory, we would not give special treatment to our own wonderful Minaki Lodge. Minaki Lodge is being advertised through Radisson Hotels.

I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, since I am on my feet, that the bookings are going ahead extremely well. If you want to go up there, I would advise you to book early.

2:20 p.m.

Mr. Nixon: I am sure the minister is aware that under our present status of indemnity it would not be possible for my wife and me and my little family even to consider going up there at \$135 a day. Unlike the ministers, who fly up there in their own aircraft and get free provision of service, the rest of us just have to press our

noses against the shiny glass of Minaki Lodge and see what all the rich people are doing.

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

Mr. Nixon: This leads me to my supplementary. The minister has helped me with this, because we are told that 8.5 million copies were distributed in Ontario and the United States—nowhere else in Canada—at a cost of \$2,264,781, and I was wondering if perhaps the only reference to Minaki was under the item "Sunset Country," where they advertise "Millionaire Days."

Is that the reference to Minaki? And as the minister in charge of this main thrust of job development in northwestern Ontario, why would he equate it with "Mosquito Bite Lodge" and those other places that are privately owned in the area, trying their best to make a living in competition with the millions of dollars that the minister puts forward against them rather than in favour of them? Surely this is an oversight that the minister cannot explain.

Hon. Mr. Baetz: I do not really see the question there, but obviously the acting Leader of the Opposition has once again illustrated that his party simply does not understand northern Ontario or northwestern Ontario.

I will personally send him the statistics to show him he has missed many thousands of man-days of work that we have created up there and how much this means to the economy of that wonderful northwest—the "Sunset Country," as he quite correctly refers to it. It is a brilliant place, a wonderful place, and this lodge has meant an enormous input into the economy there. I will send him the statistics personally because he has some difficulty over there understanding what Minaki Lodge really means to the north.

Mr. Philip: Mr. Speaker, the minister will understand that with an expenditure of \$44 million this has worked out to \$300,000 per job for 150 jobs, of which only 30 are permanent. Can the minister tell us exactly how many local jobs have been created and how many are permanent for northern Ontario as a result of this very large expenditure of the taxpayers' money?

Mr. Speaker: I do not think that is a supplementary question.

Hon. Mr. Baetz: Mr. Speaker, there is some one else there who apparently does not have the information or chooses not to see the impact of Minaki Lodge both through its renovation period and now particularly in long-range terms. Some

140 people will be working there for six or seven months of the year, quite a few of them year-round, so the impact there with respect to creating jobs is something tremendous.

One of the honourable member's earlier leaders also did not believe it, and when I was up at Minaki the last time they showed me the exact spot on the road where they said: "Here is where we stopped Stephen Lewis. We wouldn't let him get any closer to the place."

Minaki Lodge is making a real impact on the employment situation in that area of the world.

Mr. O'Neil: Mr. Speaker, I notice the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) has gone out, but maybe I could ask the minister whether or not he might give the Treasurer a minute to give us the rates at his lodge, which are likely to be a little cheaper.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: I feel it is imperative that I read you a note I received, signed by somebody named Frank, while I was asking the question. It says: "You'll like the rates at our lodge. In addition, you get a member's 25 per cent discount."

Mr. Speaker: That sounds like a commercial.

Hon. Mr. Baetz: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker: I just want to say here and now that Minaki Lodge is competitive with any lodge in this province, including the Treasurer's.

[Later]

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order to correct the record before the Minister of Tourism and Recreation gets on my back. On page 38 of his publication Minaki is referred to, but the hotel of the Treasurer is not. The rates of Minaki—\$130 a day—are not listed, nor is it stated how to get there. I thought perhaps I should bring this to the minister's further attention.

INSPECTION OF NURSING HOMES

Mr. McClellan: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Health about nursing homes. By way of preface, the minister will recall that on February 21 and February 22 I identified four nursing homes and asked him to give a full report to us about their record of compliance or noncompliance with the act and the regulations. The minister has not had either the courage or the courtesy to reply to those questions.

Specifically, today I want to ask about one of those nursing homes, the Country Place Nursing Home in Richmond Hill. Is he aware that his chief inspector has verified violations of the regulations at that nursing home that include, as

preposterous as this seems, the nursing home closing down its kitchen as a cost-saving measure in January 1983? The meals are now prepared in another building on other premises and are delivered to the residents in a golf cart. Is the minister aware of that?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, there are 340 nursing homes. If the member wants to have an intelligent discussion about any of the 340 nursing homes in this province, all he has to do is call my office in the morning and tell me which one he wants to discuss in question period.

Mr. McClellan: How many times should I raise it? This is the third time.

Mr. Speaker: Order

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Do not get nervous. We have recently sent out several notices to nursing homes in the province pursuant to the crack-down on inspections. I talked about that here several months ago. That may well be one of them. If the member wants a list of them I will be happy to provide it.

Mr. McClellan: The minister has a nerve. This is the third time I have brought this particular nursing home to his attention and asked for a report. He has continued to stonewall.

Is he aware that the same chief inspector, Mr. Gould, verified that food at the Country Place Nursing Home frequently consists of left-over food that is puréed and served the subsequent day? Is he aware that the residents are receiving baby foods? Is he aware that there is a shortage of supplies, including a shortage of linen? How many times, and on what occasions prior to March 1983, have his inspectors found violations of the Nursing Homes Act and regulations at the Country Place Nursing Home?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The member knows very well in his experience in this House that if he wants an answer to that sort of question he should put it in Orders and Notices and we will be pleased to provide it.

If there are two or three matters the member is still awaiting information on, then I must say I understood, in regard to the two or three homes in question, all that information had been forwarded to him by now. I will find out why it has not been forwarded to him and he will have it forthwith.

Might I also say that if the member wants to get into the business of discussing the state of affairs in nursing homes, I hope he will be a little more cautious and a little better researched than his leader was in a quite outrageous display the day he made his vaunted speech in this

House at the opening of the session. As we reviewed the accusations he made here without prior notice and without doing sufficient research, we found he was inaccurate in so many cases that I have been waiting for him to stand up and take another crack at it during question period so that I might review, for the members of this House, what a hideous exercise he did in doing his research.

Perhaps the member will invite him, when he returns from Dallas, to stand up and discuss nursing homes with me, and we will review the thoroughness of his research. It is all here; let us see who has the information.

Ms. Capps: Mr. Speaker, when the minister talks about having a full and responsible discussion, I think what we need to look at is not simply isolating three or four nursing homes; we need to have a look at the inspection service and at the situation that faces every nursing home across Ontario.

I know the minister promised in the last session that we would be getting access to inspection reports that would be made public. Can he give us any indication when this information will be available for all nursing homes so that we can have a responsible discussion and not simply point a finger at one nursing home without having facts?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: July 1, Mr. Speaker.
2:30 p.m.

Mr. McClellan: We will see how the minister's bravado stands up as we deal with these cases one at a time. Does the minister not understand that his enforcement of the Nursing Homes Act and regulations in this province is a joke and, instead of making smart-alec replies, will he make a serious commitment to table the answers to the question I raised here February 21, February 22 and again today?

So that the minister understands it and so there is no weaseling out, specifically how many times and on what occasions have his inspectors found violations of the Nursing Homes Act and regulations at each of the following nursing homes: The Good Samaritan Nursing Home in Alliston, Barton Place Nursing Home in Toronto, Country Place Nursing Home in Richmond Hill and the Lakewood Nursing Home in Huntsville?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Again, I can say in all seriousness I did think that was provided to the member. I thought it was. I do not like—

Mr. McClellan: Maybe while you were bouncing around in Switzerland somebody forgot to send it over.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Maybe when the member for York South (Mr. Rae) gets back from Dallas we will find out whether he wants to try nursing homes again.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Is he staying at the Radisson Hotel?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is right. He is staying at the Radisson Hotel in Dallas, the same chain that is operating Minaki Lodge. I presume he will come back with glowing reviews over the future of Minaki.

Mr. Foulds: Better get them to run the nursing homes as well.

Mr. Martel: You can get anything for \$45 million.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Hold it, troops. In any case, the member will have that information by six o'clock this evening.

SECURICOR INVESTIGATION AND SECURITY LTD.

Mr. Mackenzie: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Solicitor General. Given the stinging condemnation of Securicor in the Ontario Labour Relations Board decision of this Friday past, what is the minister's response to the decision, which indicates, and I give him two short quotes, "In addition, these actions would be illegal apart altogether from the Labour Relations Act," and "We consider the unlawful conduct of Securicor to constitute flagrant and [shocking] violations of section 64"?

What action is the minister prepared to take with respect to the licensing of David Ivers in particular and with respect to the principals of Securicor who counselled illegal activities and actually engaged in improper conduct?

Hon. G. W. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, we have just received the decision in printed form from the Ontario Labour Relations Board and members of the ministry are reviewing the content of it. When they have reviewed it, I will be able to make a further comment as to the direction in which we may go on the material contained in that decision.

Mr. Mackenzie: It is almost a year since I first started asking the minister questions on this. Or page 32, paragraph 41 clearly states that part of Securicor's defence was that its actions "were known and condoned by two sets of police" in the province. Since when have the police in Ontario been silent bystanders in dirty, illegal and covert activities designed to undermine the laws of the province, and what action will the minister be taking?

Hon. G. W. Taylor: The honourable member has suggested and alleged that the police are condoning this, or possibly are part of this, by reading part of the decision out of context. In no way do I accept that the police in this province condone or accept any of the type of activities that possibly have taken place in this regard. The police do an excellent job in the service of the people of Ontario, and in no way will I accept the comment that those actions have been condoned by the police in this province or by the Ontario Provincial Police.

Mr. Wrye: Mr. Speaker, surely that is a totally inadequate answer. The Metropolitan Toronto Police and the Ontario Provincial Police knew for some period of time that Mr. Ivers was involved as an agent provocateur with that company. Yet they did not go to the Steelworkers union until February, until the point had come when the actions of Mr. Ivers were becoming suspicious to the Steelworkers themselves.

Does the minister believe it is acceptable behaviour for the police to condone the actions of this kind of agent provocateur in the first place, and does he not agree with me that the actions of the police in this case will do absolutely nothing to convince the labour movement in this province that the police are neutral in labour disputes?

Hon. G. W. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, the police are neutral in these matters. I challenge the honourable member to show instances where they are not. They perform their duties under the law of this province and do an admirable job in the situations they encounter.

Mr. Mackenzie: I am not sure whether the Solicitor General is aware of it, but the police knew as early as October 4 that Ivers was lying when he said he was not a security employee. That means they were aware, not just since the time at which they first reported it to the union but as far back as October.

On page 50, section 63 of the OLRB decision, the following comments are made: "The board views this aspect of Mr. Ivers' activities with deep concern because in our experience strike situations are volatile enough without the introduction of this type of outside influence. It is one thing to report upon disorder on the picket line; it is quite another to be part of it. The remedies for this aspect of the respondent's activities lie largely in other forums, but to the extent that they contravene the Labour Rela-

tions Act they are a matter of serious concern to this board."

What is the minister prepared to do in terms of criminal charges against those who counsel theft and other illegal activities?

Hon. G. W. Taylor: As I mentioned before, the time we would consider any charges would be after we have reviewed the material: the transcript, the decision. If there are any facts that come out of that review, if any laws of the province have been transgressed, naturally there will be consultation as to whether criminal proceedings should follow.

CURRICULUM GUIDELINES

Mr. Bradley: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Education. Is the minister aware of the concerns being expressed by administrators, department heads and classroom teachers about the ramifications of implementing the Ontario Schools: Intermediate/Senior draft curriculum guidelines? If she is, will she inform the House as to the manner in which she is addressing these concerns within the somewhat narrow time frame she is permitted for a response to the OSIS draft proposal? Is she glad I asked?

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, I would doubt that even the honourable member could suggest the time frame is narrow for a response to OSIS. I would also remind the member that is the first draft of OSIS. It was written deliberately in a relatively provocative manner to elicit as many responses as possible, and we are succeeding in that. I am certainly delighted to know that is happening.

Hon. Mr. Welch: He's a teacher, you know.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Of course, yes.

I am sure the member will be responding himself, personally, as a former teacher in the system, along with his colleague the member for Kitchener-Wilmot (Mr. Sweeney), who is a former director of education, principal and teacher. They might consult with at least five or six of their colleagues in the New Democratic Party caucus who were also teachers. I forgot about the member for London North (Mr. Van Horne), who is a former director of education in that area.

Hon. Mr. Welch: And not to overlook the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk (Mr. Nixon).

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Oh, but it is so long since he taught it does not really matter any more.

Mr. Nixon: About as long as you have been away from medicine.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Oh, it is far longer since the honourable member taught than it is that I practised medicine.

Mr. Speaker: Now to the question, please.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: The responses have certainly been fulsome. Some of them have expressed a very real concern based upon strange interpretations of both the Renewal of Secondary Education report and OSIS. I must say we have been attempting to overcome some of the groundless fears that have been expressed, because they have been fostered rather deliberately by certain individuals. None the less, we believe the final draft of OSIS will be ready for fall publication and distribution. It will have had the benefit of a great deal of response from the public as well as from the educational system.

2:40 p.m.

Mr. Bradley: I am glad that in her initial answer the minister did not ruin the supplementary I have written out here.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: I tried.

Mr. Bradley: I know she tried.

Genuine concerns are being conveyed to the Ministry of Education about the financial implications of the provisions of the OSIS document and about the impact of some of the proposals on the general level or basic level students in the system, many of whom might best be served by, let us call it a modification of the stipulations in the present OSIS report—this is coming directly from classroom teachers, who are on the front line—in a different way, for instance, from those who might be university-bound or more academically oriented.

Taking that into consideration, will the minister consider delaying implementation of the OSIS provisions for an additional year or at least give thought to implementing them on an incremental basis—I think that is the way we refer to it—starting in grade 7, if indeed the ministry can meet the curriculum problems that exist?

Is the minister prepared to delay for one year the full implementation so she can make everybody in the education system happy?

Hon. Miss Stephenson: I gather that one of the great deficiencies in response to OSIS has been the lack of careful reading of ROSE on the part of many of those who responded. If the honourable members have carefully read both the recommendations of the secondary education review project and ROSE, they will recog-

nize that for the very first time concentration upon the curriculum specifically for basic level and general level students is to be demonstrated in the renewal of secondary education in this province. Their curriculum will not be simply a watered-down advanced student curriculum. They will have specific curriculum for their own needs, meeting their own educational requirements for the purposes for which they determine their educational process will be used.

In that light, those respondees to OSIS might modify some of their statements about OSIS if they really and truly understood, or indeed had read, the documents that were developed to provide the foundation for OSIS in the first place.

We are considering all options. I am not sure that any one is closed. But the honourable member demonstrates that he is one of those who really does not understand the basis of the renewal of secondary education when he makes the statement that he did, even though he quoted it from someone else's letter.

Mr. Grande: Mr. Speaker, in that the SERP report talked about the particular sets of criteria within OSIS and said the problem in secondary schools is primarily for the general level students, will the the Minister of Education admit that the report is silent, at least in the first draft, in regard to general level students and the courses for general level students?

Given the compulsory nature of the courses and that more than 50 per cent of the courses in secondary school would be compulsory, will the minister admit that it will be more difficult for the general level students to graduate, that it will increase the dropout rate and that in effect accessibility to post-secondary education will be denied to a lot of students in this province?

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, the member for Oakwood is barking up the wrong tree as usual. He has not read the hymn book properly, the one he is trying to sing from.

Mr. Cooke: You're the only one who barks around here.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: He barks and sings at the same time. You cannot tell the difference.

Hon. Mr. Welch: You are feeling better, aren't you?

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Yes, I am. It is obvious there are specific problems which must be addressed in secondary school education for the general level students. It was because of our concern about those students that we appointed the secondary education review project in the

first place, and it was on the basis of their concern about the way in which the secondary education should be organized for those students specifically that their report was drafted and our response was drafted.

It is our intent to ensure that none of the actions we take will increase the dropout rate but will encourage students, particularly at the general level, to remain longer within the school system because they will recognize that the courses they are taking are of value to them in their career choices and will provide them with the appropriate background for their lifespan as well as for their careers.

That is our intention. That is the direction in which we are moving and that, unfortunately, is what the member does not see.

SPEAKER'S WEDDING ANNIVERSARY

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, on a very quick perusal of the rules I find nothing in them that precludes a minister of the crown asking a question. I have a question and I would like a precise yes or no. Is it true that 36 years ago today you married your wife, June?

Mr. Speaker: It is indeed true.

[Applause]

SECURICOR INVESTIGATION AND SECURITY LTD.

Mr. Mackenzie: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Labour.

Given the seriousness with which the Ontario Labour Relations Board views the illegal and incredibly damaging involvement of security firms like Securicor in employee-employer relationships and the clear statement by the board that disclosure laws are a necessary addition to tough labour board policing, what is the minister prepared to do in terms of legislative action to deal with this industrial relations cancer we seem to have growing in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, from my preliminary perusal of the decision and listening to some of the senior leaders in the trade union movement, I certainly get the impression that the Ontario Labour Relations Board was well able to address the matter of Securicor.

Mr. Mackenzie: The minister's answer never varies and it does not deal with the question. He knows full well that covert actions can cause serious harm to employees, whether or not they are aware of a spy in their midst.

The decision of the OLRB clearly recognizes this fact in arguing for disclosure laws, citing the

Landrum-Griffin Act in the United States, which seems to have been successful in this particular situation, infiltration of picket lines.

Will the minister comment on the reference to the need for such legislation recommended by the board and the very clear indication that they need this kind of action over and above the policing of the board?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: I was in the company of the member for Hamilton East in Collingwood on Saturday afternoon. At that time he asked me the question. I gave him the answer that I just gave. I wanted to be sure my answer was consistent.

As far as the answer to his second question is concerned, senior officials of my minister and I will be meeting first thing tomorrow morning to study in depth the decision by the Ontario Labour Relations Board in regard to Securicor. I think it would be inappropriate for me to make any comment until I have had an opportunity to discuss the matter.

Mr. Wrye: Mr. Speaker, given that Mr. Ivers testified that he routinely infiltrates companies posing as a worker and reports to companies about drug use, alcoholism, theft and a whole variety of other things, some of which may be fact, some of which may be fiction and all of which in a sense violate civil liberties, and in view of the fact that the Ontario Labour Relations Board has given a clear statement on the unacceptability of industrial espionage within the framework of collective bargaining, why will the minister not give us a commitment now to introduce legislation that would prohibit such offensive practices in equally clear terms?

2:50 p.m.

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, I can only repeat what I said a few moments ago. Certainly the possibilities will be thoroughly studied, but I do not think the honourable member opposite expects me to make some sort of a commitment just two days after a decision has been handed down. If I did make a decision within two days of a decision of that nature, of that seriousness, of that complexity, the member would be standing up here in the House and criticizing me for over-reacting.

MASSEY-FERGUSON

Mr. Barlow: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Industry and Trade. A few days ago, I received a phone call at my home. I might add that this call really disturbed me. In view of the fact that this government has a very

substantial investment in Massey-Ferguson, I would like the minister to verify for me whether it is true that two weeks ago today, on May 1, the complete combine line had to close down because a large percentage of the shift had phoned in sick but, in fact, they went fishing at the opening of the trout season.

Hon. Mr. Walker: Mr. Speaker, I do not know the answer to the question, but I have heard the rumour as well and I think it is something we might inquire about. On the other hand, if the employees chose to take the day off for whatever reason, I suppose that is their choice and they are the ones who are diminished in income. Maybe there is fisherman's flu going around or something. Sixty-nine per cent of the line, when there are 3,000 people working there, is quite an extensive turnout. Whatever the case, I will be glad to look into the question.

ONTARIO HOME RENEWAL PROGRAM FUNDS

Mr. Wrye: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, and it concerns the Ontario home renewal program. In reply to questions put to the minister by my colleague the member for Waterloo North (Mr. Epp) and myself last month, he indicated he had not excluded the possibility of replacing the Ontario home renewal program with some other renovation or rehabilitation program.

The minister is aware that last week's budget promises no relief and represents no new initiatives for the low-income families that are in desperate need of such a program, despite the fact that it contains a very positive job creation component. Now that the budget has destroyed the hopes of hundreds of municipalities and thousands of low-income families that they might have housing that meets minimum standards, where does the minister suggest they look for money?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member goes back and looks at my answer of the day, I believe I also indicated very clearly that the federal government had implemented a program to allow for refurbishing, renovation and rehabilitation of units. I very clearly said at the time that there appeared to be another complication that had been thrown into the situation, in that the feds had come along and attempted to duplicate the program. If he will recall, I said I believed that is the direction we will go in the ministry. Those people who inquire of the ministry, and indeed the municipalities, will be referred to the federal agency.

Mr. Wrye: If the minister is referring to the Canada home renovation plan, he will be aware that it provides only 30 per cent and people on welfare cannot afford to find the rest of the money. Since apparently the minister has not done any checking with the municipalities, perhaps he is unaware of what large and small municipalities all over the province are telling us about cancellation of the program.

The town of Penetanguishene—and I am quoting from letters—says, "This is an old town and we are concerned that the province may not reinstitute the OHRP and it would certainly be detrimental in the long run." The town of Goderich says, "Fifty jobs funded by OHRP over the past three years certainly contributed to the wellbeing of local contractors, whether they hired new staff or were able to maintain present staff levels in slow economic times."

My colleague the member for St. Catharines (Mr. Bradley) is well aware that there are 81 applications outstanding in the town of St. Catharines.

The town of Welland says, "The program is very worth while and without adequate funding much of the existing housing, which is below minimum standards, will not be upgraded. But it is imperative that it be reintroduced."

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

Mr. Wrye: In the town of North Bay, the cancellation of this program will have a substantial effect on the ability of that town to bring its housing up to standards. Even the little township of Elderslie says, "We have approximately 12 names on our waiting list at this time and, working through a repayment of moneys, we could only fund two applications a year." So 10 more people will have to be told they are out of luck.

Given that demonstrated need and given the ability of the program to create jobs, rehabilitate older homes and save the province money by reducing the need for the government to build new low-income housing, will the minister make a commitment to review the cancellation of the program once again and see whether we cannot get this program, which is so popular with municipalities and the low-income people who have benefited from it, back on track?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: I said at the time that we would continue to review the program. Let me do an analysis of the remarks made by the member first on the number of applications that are outstanding in the various municipalities throughout Ontario. If one looks at the applica-

tions that have been outstanding each and every year the program has been under operation—obviously we never funded the program, nor was it even within our expectations to fund the program, to the full extent of maximum applications or 100 per cent of the applications each year; very clearly that was not our expectation.

The member will recall the program was 100 per cent provincially funded. Most municipalities have operated very effectively and efficiently under the program. They have lent some of the money and have written some of it off. They had that option. They were able to charge interest rates on some of the moneys they lent and now have developed, to some degree, a revolving account. The member can shake his head. The whole funding was by the province and the basis of it was laid down very carefully and clearly as to how it would function.

The member made one statement that is not applicable. He indicated a person on welfare was eligible. If he goes back and checks the terms of reference, he will see there had to be the ability to repay some portion of the loan. If the member checks on that, he will find there were none, to the best of my knowledge. I cannot say everyone operated 100 per cent by the rules. Obviously, as the member knows, some municipalities did a little configuration of their own.

We continue to review all our programs. They do have a true application. This is not to be the exception.

FRENCH-LANGUAGE SERVICES

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Education with respect to the French school situation in Iroquois Falls. I was there nine days ago and want to share with her the sense of frustration people there feel.

Is the minister aware that last year there were repeated requests by the French-language advisory committee for the creation of a French-language entity and that those requests led to a survey paid for by the board of education and carried out by the Ontario Institute of Studies in Education, which is certainly a reputable body? That study, which surveyed all the francophone ratepayers in the area served by the secondary school, showed that 58 per cent of the parents wanted to have the French-language entity.

In view of the minister's commitments to this French-language entity and her commitment in March to a guarantee of the right to French-language education, is 58 per cent support not

sufficient for the ministry to go to Iroquois Falls and find a way to create the entity?

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that there has been some concern expressed about this; we have looked at that. All of this is being taken into consideration in our activities related to the solution of the problem in that area.

Mr. Cassidy: When I was in Iroquois Falls, I also met with a group of parents who were opposed to the creation of the entity. Their prime concern was the understanding they had that their children would be forced to take all their education in French if an entity were created and their children were in the French-language entity. These were Franco-Ontarians.

Will the minister give this House and those parents reassurance that if the entity is created and their children wish to take a certain number of courses in English while they are part of the entity, that will be their option and that should not be an obstacle to the creation of a French-language entity at the school in Iroquois Falls?

Hon. Miss Stephenson: I am sorry; I was interrupted during the midst of the question expounded by the member for Ottawa East—

Mr. Cassidy: Ottawa Centre.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Ottawa Centre. Pardon me. Forgive me.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: One and the same.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: The Tuesday and Friday member is the member for Ottawa East (Mr. Roy). Right? Could the member repeat the latter part of his question?

Mr. Speaker: Briefly, please.

Mr. Cassidy: Given the concern of the French-speaking parents who have opposed the entity because they believe the creation of it in Iroquois Falls would compel their children to take courses in French only and they would not be able to take enough courses in English to become bilingual, will the minister reassure the parents who are blocking the entity that it would not require that all courses be taken in French but that if pupils desire, they would have the option of taking a substantial number of courses in English?

3 p.m.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: The member does not really understand the establishment of the entity. When a francophone entity is established, it is one in which the instruction is carried out in the French language. That is indeed a French-language school. If it is in a building with an

anglophone entity, then obviously the students must make a choice as to whether they will attend the one or the other.

In Iroquois Falls at the present time, in a bilingual or mixed-language program, there is an opportunity to study to a certain degree in the French language and the remainder in the English language.

It is because of the concern of those parents who have added their names to a very lengthy petition—and as I perceive the list almost all of them are francophone—that we have to look at the problem from both aspects that have been developed in attempting to find a response in Iroquois Falls.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, does it not concern the minister that this whole business of using numbers for the identification of people who want to attend the entity is nothing more than a popularity contest and that the provision of services for a minority should be done on that basis? In Smooth Rock Falls, which is not far from Iroquois Falls, 32 anglophone students were granted an English-language entity some time in the past, yet in Iroquois Falls something like 300 francophone students are being denied the same privilege. That is 10 times more students. This whole business of using fractions, percentages and so forth as a measure is really a popularity contest. It is an unfair way to deal with minorities.

Mr. Speaker: That was no question.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, the use of figures, percentages, etc., has not been a directive of the Ministry of Education. It has not been a point which the Ministry of Education has proposed as a way—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The member did not ask a question but rather made a statement.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege: The minister's information directly contradicts information I have received from two senior officials of her ministry with respect to—

Mr. Speaker: Order. The honourable member will please resume his seat.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege: I did ask the minister a question. Does she not agree this is an unfair method? I did ask that so there was a question in there, Mr. Speaker, if you will verify it from Hansard.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, but then you went on.

Mr. Boudria: But I did ask a question.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the minister could respond with "yes" or "no?" Does she think it is unfair?

Hon. Miss Stephenson: I simply said that we have never used that basis. That is not a directive of the Ministry of Education.

PUBLIC LIBRARIES IN ONTARIO

Mr. G. I. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Citizenship and Culture. The ministry has spent a long time studying the public library system in Ontario with an eye to making changes in the Public Libraries Act. The outcome to date has been the green paper, *A Foundation for the Future*. Will the minister permit the library community to comment on the draft legislation before the bill receives final reading?

Hon. Mr. McCaffrey: Mr. Speaker, in all likelihood, the answer to that question will be yes. We are now receiving responses to the consultation paper and I think we have received about 200. I would have no hesitation in doing that. There are some proprieties we would want to look at collectively.

I do not think we can send out a draft bill but if we can, we will. However, if we cannot send out a draft bill, we will make certain the explanatory notes that would accompany a bill are circulated. We will do everything we can within the proper procedures of the House to make sure the last step in the consultative process is a full step.

Mr. G. I. Miller: How soon will it be dealt with? If the minister is not going to send out the draft bill could it be dealt with at the committee level?

Hon. Mr. McCaffrey: Dealing with it at the committee level would be an option but I think another two and one half weeks or so would be required before all of the responses, many of which are still coming in, are properly collated and we are in a position to deal with them. We should have the draft legislation in place by mid to late summer; I think that is as close as my guess could be. I see no difficulty in our achieving that objective. Certainly by the fall we would want to table the proposed legislative changes.

Mr. Foulds: Mr. Speaker, there is considerable division within the library community about the matter and I believe in the consultation paper there is some ignoring of the previous review that was conducted by—I have forgotten the chap's name, but it was the librarian from

Scarborough. Because of that, could the minister give us the assurance that, if the legislation were tabled in the fall, he would leave it on the order paper for the fall and then proceed with it in a subsequent session of the Legislature rather than during that session?

Hon. Mr. McCaffrey: Mr. Speaker, that is certainly an option. I think what all of us would have to look at is whether we are just delaying a series of changes that are inevitable. I think it is the balance between a full and thorough hearing, particularly after the Bassnett study and the consultation paper. I would have no difficulty in doing that but I think the member's opening statement is a particularly operative statement. The library community is split on a number of things, including how much longer we are going to consult on this matter before we get on with the changes. That is a legitimate point of many of the people in the community.

I do not want to rush ahead after all this time. If we could have the proposed changes in place by late summer in the form of explanatory notes or a draft bill, have that circulated and get some response, we could table it and get on with it. If we cannot meet that objective of tabling and circulating it, to deal with it at another session is certainly still an option. It would not be my first choice, however.

EMPLOYEE HEALTH AND SAFETY

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour regarding Canadian General Electric and the 25 women who have cancer or tumours. Is the minister aware of a statement made by the company last week? It said, "An official government investigation into the CGE Dufferin Street lamps plant has confirmed the company's position that there are no known cancer causing substances in the coiling area of that plant."

The second part said, "The ministry reported to the company and the union that no recognized cancer causing substance had been found in the coiling process and advised that no further literature or laboratory investigation was warranted pending the results of the study."

Does the minister agree with the company that methylene chloride is not a mild carcinogen and is being used there? Would the minister also indicate if the workers can be assured that none of the processes used there might be what is causing a high incidence of cancer among those women?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, nothing has changed from earlier responses to questions

from the member in respect to the circumstances at Canadian General Electric, neither in my mind nor as far as I am concerned within the ministry. We still feel the same way we did previously. We are still moving forward on a study that is being done by McMaster University and we are prepared to participate and support that to the fullest.

Mr. Martel: Is the minister telling me this statement by the company is erroneous? Secondly and most important, because I misunderstood his answer as to the study he talks about at McMaster, is it not a fact that the epidemiological study has not yet started? Is the minister aware that last week the company told the union that, if it wanted that study to be funded by it, it should "get Martel to shut his mouth"?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: I am not aware of the statements the member for Sudbury East has attributed to the company.

ACID RAIN

Mr. T. P. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of the Environment, if I can get his attention.

Is the minister satisfied with the fact that Ontario Hydro is not putting scrubbers in the plant at Atikokan? Is his ministry satisfied that this will not add to the acid rain problem in the area? Has his ministry had a look at that?

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, the answers are yes and yes.

3:10 p.m.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

MINISTRY OF COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Miss Stephenson moved, seconded by Hon. Mr. Welch, first reading of Bill 42, An Act to amend the Ministry of Colleges and Universities Act.

Motion agreed to.

INCOME TAX AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Ashe moved, seconded by Hon. Mr. Leluk, first reading of Bill 43, An Act to amend the Income Tax Act.

3:38 p.m.

The House divided on Hon. Mr. Ashe's motion, which was agreed to on the following vote:

Ayes

Andrewes, Ashe, Baetz, Barlow, Bennett, Bernier, Birch, Brandt, Cousens, Cureatz, Davis,

Dean, Drea, Eaton, Elgie, Eves, Fish, Gillies, Gregory, Grossman, Havrot, Hennessy, Hodgson, Johnson, J. M., Jones, Kells, Kennedy, Kerr, Kolyn, Lane, Leluk, MacQuarrie;

McCaffrey, McCague, McLean, McMurtry, Miller, F. S., Mitchell, Norton, Pollock, Pope, Ramsay, Robinson, Rotenberg, Runciman, Sheppard, Shymko, Stephenson, B. M., Stevenson, K. R., Taylor, G. W., Taylor, J. A., Timbrell, Treleaven, Villeneuve, Walker, Watson, Welch, Wells, Williams, Wiseman, Yakabuski.

Nays

Allen, Boudria, Bradley, Breithaupt, Bryden, Cooke, Copps, Edighoffer, Elston, Foulds, Grande, Haggerty, Johnston, R. F., Kerrio, Laughren, Lupusella, Mackenzie, Martel, McClellan, Miller, G. I., Newman, Nixon, O'Neil, Philip, Renwick, Riddell, Ruprecht, Ruston, Samis, Sweeney, Van Horne, Wildman, Worton, Wrye.

Ayes 61; nays 34.

3:40 p.m.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: Mr. Speaker, this bill contains two amendments arising out of the Treasurer's (Mr. F. S. Miller) excellent budget of May 10, 1983.

First, the bill introduces a temporary income tax surcharge for the years 1983 and 1984, at 2.5 per cent and five per cent respectively, on the basic Ontario tax. The surcharge will apply only to taxpayers with taxable income in excess of the threshold established for the application of the Ontario tax reduction program. Therefore, for 1983 the surcharge will not apply to taxpayers with taxable income less than \$2,179.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: That's right. It's all right here.

The second amendment sets the tax rate for 1983 at 48 per cent of the basic federal tax. This is the same rate as for the 1982 taxation year. Up until now the rate had to be legislated every year, even when there was no change from the previous year. As a tax simplification measure the bill now provides that the 48 per cent rate will remain in effect for 1983 and subsequent years until a rate change is required.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS IN ORDERS AND NOTICES

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the answers to questions 1 to 7, 10 to 14, 18 to 28, 30 to 34, 184, 186 and 192 and the interim answers to questions 8, 9, 15 to 17, 29, 35 to 183, 185, 187 to 191 and 193 to 195, all of these

standing on the notice paper [see Hansard for Friday, May 20, 1983].

Mr. Foulds: The minister said they were going to answer this at the end of November, and I had an interim answer last session.

Hon. Mr. Wells: The member has another interim answer.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

BUDGET DEBATE

(continued)

Resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion that this House approves in general the budgetary policy of the government.

Mr. Mackenzie: Mr. Speaker, I rise to make a few remarks in the budget debate. First, it is pretty hard to get excited when you get a budget such as we had presented in this House the other day and, second, to feel that there is much hope for young people and workers in Ontario. One of the first things I had to ask myself was, is the government living in a real world or has it totally lost touch with reality? Because surely there are two issues that are bothering people today. One of them is jobs; and I do not know where some of the members across the way are these days, but the other one is very much a case of security. Workers simply want to know what kind of security there is, what kind of future they possibly have in this great province of ours.

I took a look at the figures on page 40 of the budget and I noted that in 1981 employment was listed as 4.186 million, in 1982 it was listed as 4.078 million and, in the government's own figures, in 1983 we are to end up with 4.041 million. We have heard a lot about all the jobs this government has been creating, but unless I am missing the bottom line this simply says to me that we are going to have 37,000 fewer people working in Ontario at the end of 1983 than we had at the end of 1982. I think that is nothing short of dishonest. I think the entire presentation of the budget was an exercise in deception, and I do not know any other way to put it.

I take a look at the deficit they are talking about. First, on page 57 of the budget, I see the estimated revenues for 1983-84 are \$22.015 billion. Then, in the expenditures on page 59, I see a neat little bit of sleight-of-hand—the old pea-under-the-pod routine, I guess—where we actually have a \$25.010-billion expenditure list. Mind you, you can throw in, as the Treasurer

(Mr. F. S. Miller) neatly did, the \$300 million that has the little brackets around, which says he is going to find another \$300 million to cut out of the expenditures; but he did not have the guts to tell us from where when he submitted the budget to the House.

If you do not achieve that projected further cut of expenditures in the budget, we actually have a \$3-billion deficit. What we were told, of course, in all the rhetoric that went with the budget, was that we would have a \$2.7-billion deficit. I do not know why the government and the members of that government cannot be honest to begin with and tell us it is a \$3-billion deficit and not a \$2.7-billion deficit, because that is exactly what it is.

I will not go into this in great detail, but I can recall some of the criticism from across the way when we projected a deficit last year—I forget the figure now—just as we have done again this year in the proposals we have made. Last year the Tory deficit ended up just about the same size as ours was—the one they made fun of—the difference being that most of our deficit was in specific, long-term job-creation proposals. I do not think the message has ever got through to the members across the way that they are either going to spend the money as a deficit or on unemployment. You only have to look at the amount we are paying in welfare and unemployment insurance benefits and what the municipalities are being stuck with.

Surely there is nothing wrong with outlining a budget with a deficit if most of that deficit is in specific job-creation projects. That will at least put people to work and it may just start cutting some of the deficit. Certainly it would mean we would have fewer people on the unemployment rolls in the province and that people would have just a little bit more pride and security because they would be working. It is almost as if working were some kind of sin, yet nobody will more quickly criticize people who are not employed and not getting out and doing their best to find a job than some of the members across the way. There is something wrong, something perverse in the priorities we have in this country of ours.

3:50 p.m.

The question of security is one that will come home to roost for an awful lot of members in this House. I know it is bothering people. I know it is just about the top concern in society now. We have to be concerned when there are 780,000 people out of work in the province, when there are 230,000 or more women out of work, and

when there are some 220,000 young people between the ages of 15 and 24 out of work. We have to start wondering what they see as their future, what they see as their hope. They can only be shoved back into schools, universities or training programs for so long. Many of them do not see much of a possibility, even with the additional training.

Another thing that bothers me is we seem to be putting all our eggs in the one basket with the call that we have to move quickly into the high-tech generation. We do not seem to have a concern about the cybernetics of society today, with automation and robotization. We say it is great and we have to start developing the high-tech sector of our economy. When we see what is happening with traditional industry in our province, we have to wonder.

Once again the members may get sick of hearing it, but an awful lot of our problems lie in our branch-plant economy and the fact that many of the multinationals which have put up branch plants in this country of ours are bigger than governments. They make the decisions and they make them when there is little in the way of legislation or requirement that they have some responsibility to the people of this province.

We see these companies shutting down their branch plants in this country or using the current buzzword of corporate rationalization. We have gone through this many times and I will deal with three or four of them. It does not always succeed, but it is done so the company will be a little healthier and better able to compete in world markets today. The one consideration that is not there is what happens to the workers they dump along the way, the employees who have worked in those plants, in many cases with long seniority.

There is a drastic drop in our traditional industries. With that drop, if we follow the pattern of contract settlements over the last year or two—and I predict it is going to get worse—we find that settlements of less than five and six per cent are the norm. I know of two recently in my own town of 4.8 per cent. Indeed, some people are so scared they will work for almost anything in an area where there is no organization or union to protect the workers.

To my way of thinking, we are seeing a deliberate depression of wage levels in this province. It is made easy with the kind of unemployment we have.

If we are to be successful, and if we are to be the beneficiaries of this drive for high tech in

this province, I think the question that has to be asked is what makes us think we will necessarily be the beneficiaries. Almost every country in the free western world and a good deal of the Third World are desperately trying to be the successors in the fight to develop or get this high technology in place. There is no guarantee we will get that many jobs out of it. I do not think anybody argues it is one of the components we have to look at and do what we can to achieve. However, if we do, what will we end up with?

Are we looking at the traditional wages in a better-paying industrial plant that may have been paying anywhere from \$8 or \$9 to \$12, \$13, \$14 or \$15 an hour? That is not a heck of a lot, but with it people could afford to buy a house, a few of the extra consumer goods we try to sell and have some chance of assisting their kids to get through university. I am darn sure most of the people in this House understand some of the costs involved there.

I currently have three children who have not had much success with jobs. I am trying to help finance them through university. I will have four, starting next year. I am better off than most people and I know darn well it has been about as tight a financial year for me as I have ever seen, trying to assist them.

If we are heading for the kind of a society where we have depressed the wages and where we are going to have to argue economy to get new high-tech industry in this province, are we really asking our people to say goodbye to high wages? There is no point in protecting much of the traditional industry that pays good wages at the moment when we want high-tech industry. Are we going to end up with \$7 or \$8-an-hour jobs? I think that begs the question; this government is not looking at the planning of our priorities.

If we can do all this production and get all these benefits out of a move to high technology in this province, what are we going to do about distribution? Whether we want to face it or not, that is what we have got to look at. I do not think our problem any longer is production. We hope like blazes that some of the slack will be taken up with the service industries and trades, health and others. There is no question that we can now and will increasingly be able to produce just about everything we need, and do it with fewer and fewer people.

The problem then is not production. It is the distribution of the goods. How do we get the goods around? How do we give people the ability to purchase what we produce and the

ability to pay some of the bills for their families, whether for education or to buy some of the things they would like to buy, or to be assured of a reasonably secure future once they reach retirement age? We are sure as blazes not doing it by improvements in the basic pension or the Canada pension plan, a route we have long felt we should go in this province.

If we are not doing it in that area, what are we likely to achieve in the area of the few reforms we have talked about in the private pension field? It is not the major component of what people are living on when they finally reach retirement age. We are not doing a job there. Maybe that is not the right road to use for redistribution of income. One thing that is very clear to me is that our major problem is going to be how we distribute the goods we can produce or the dollars that used to be there in wages among the people in our province. How do we distribute them to the 780,000 people who are currently out of work in this province?

We have not given much thought to that. The budget's chief approach seems to be short-term job creation, hoping like blazes we can either get a few more young people working or what seems to me to be more the pattern, establish some make-work projects that might get somebody who has currently run out of benefits back on the labour force for enough weeks to qualify once again for Unemployment Insurance Commission benefits. Quite frankly, that is one hell of a way to run a society and not an awful lot to give people in the way of hope.

I cannot understand why we are not dealing more directly with the corporate rationalization problem we have. I know I have raised this matter before. I intend to keep on raising it as I look at the plants closing in my own town, such as the six most recent ones; Consolidated-Bathurst, Allen Industries, Flavorite Poultry, H. & R. Johnson, PPG Industries' glass division; and Western Star Trucks which just joined the list last week, another small plant closed down. It is going to do a warehousing operation only here in Ontario.

We get the kind of answer we got the other day that I mentioned in this House during the throne speech debate. We asked the president of Consolidated-Bathurst: "Why are you closing down this Hamilton plant that you have just spent \$2.8 million in upgrading? Why are you letting 140-odd employees, who have an average of 24, 25 and 26 years seniority, go without even giving them first choice at another job within the company? Why are you putting a third shift

on in your other plants, all in the interest of the financial health of your company, and doing nothing, except what you are required to do by law or by contract, for the 140-odd workers who for 25 or 30 years have built up that plant and who happen to have skills and some real feeling for their jobs? What is your responsibility?"

The president of the company lashed back at us and said: "We have met our responsibility. We have done what is required by law and by our contract. Don't you understand that we have the right to move our order book around or our plants around?" That raises serious questions. That one bothered several of the Tories enough that even there we heard comments about their not being the best corporate citizen.

4 p.m.

That is, unfortunately, not the exception; it is happening all too often in these situations. The issue very clearly, then, is at what stage the corporate decision to be able to operate their business the way they want, to move their order book around, to move their plants around, to let those 140-odd workers go without any concern, not only for what it does to them but for the additional cost it brings down on the municipality they live in, raises serious questions. Should or should not a corporate rationalization move that is supposed to be to the benefit of that company have as one of its components a discussion with some input from the workers or the community, some feeling on the part of the government that is supposed to set the rules in this province of ours, so that part of the concern in such a move, which will so drastically affect those workers in the community, has got to be what happens to those workers?

If we are going to allow this kind of thing to happen, we should also say that there is a responsibility: some of the cost has got to be to the company that is going to let these people go, going to let that plant shut down, going to affect that community and the workers. I do not think this is asking too much. We certainly got it again in Allen Industries the other day, when their fibre division was being closed down; and we find that right now in the Ford Oakville plant there is more material in from their plant in Virginia than they have ever had, and all of the production is now going to be done in the Virginia plant, so we lose 100 or 105 workers in that particular operation in Hamilton.

The seniority there was not quite as long; most of them had about 12 to 14 years. But they have very little hope of another job, and they did not get any more than the basic requirements

that have been negotiated for them. That operation is supposed to benefit the conglomerate that owns Allen Industries. We find further, when we dig into this situation, that they are probably two or three years down the road. They would not even give us, when we had a good, efficient plant there, the benefit of the last two or three years; they are going to be replacing this particular insulation under the hoods and dashes of cars with a brand-new material. But has this government got enough clout to say, "Hey, we have already got a deficit in our auto pact parts trade"?

This government should insist that this company do some of the production here and take care of some of those workers whom they have had working up until now. No way: what we find is that the new plant will be down in Illinois, and when they finally are ready to phase out, they will do the same thing, probably, to the workers down in Virginia that they have done to the workers in Hamilton. They are the last concern.

As a matter of fact, I think what upset me most at the meeting we had in the office of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Ramsay) with the top officials of Consolidated-Bathurst was the argument they advanced. When we went after them to give some priority to the workers they were letting go in their other plants in Ontario or at least—inasmuch as they sprang this on us, and apparently even the ministry did not know it at the time, the fact that they had really already sold the plant so that the meeting was an exercise in futility to begin with—to consider talking to Reid-Dominion, the next-door firm that was buying their plant, on behalf of the workers, because the plant would be employing 60 or 70 people and maybe some of these skilled workers could be taken by this new plant, they simply told us they would not appreciate anybody telling them where to get their work force, that their workers were a market commodity and the new firm would go on the market. Sure, they might hire some; they knew of one or two who already had been hired; but they were not going to put any extra effort out, the workers were a market commodity.

I say we have sunk a long way in this tremendous province of ours when our workers become strictly a market commodity. I guess my upset is that I see nothing in this budget. I see 37,000; that is all the brand-new new youth jobs there are in that budget. All of the other programs that are listed there were already on stream. When I see that in fact, with all of the talk about what we are doing in this budget, we

are going to end up with 37,000 fewer people working at the end of 1983 than we had at the end of last year, when I see that the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) is trying to get away with telling us we are going to have only a \$2.7-billion deficit when it is \$3 billion, I call it a dishonest exercise in deception.

When I see that it does not really tackle the problem of jobs and security, then I recognize that this particular government really has no answers.

It is more than just the branch plants. I used the six or seven names in my own town, but this is happening across Ontario. It is the way labour—this market commodity, as the president of Consolidated-Bathurst calls it—is viewed today.

I think of the meeting we had last week with 45 workers—all Portuguese women who had worked at the Eaton Centre. As a matter of fact, rather than 45 women, that meeting turned out to be a meeting of 90-some odd. It drew not only every single woman who worked in that centre but from a number of other places as well, including several of the staff from our own building here.

We found the same thing happened to them as has happened in a number of government ministries. It has happened in nursing homes and in a number of other places. They had negotiated a contract and had been under tremendous pressure in negotiations to take as little as possible. They had ended with a wage range of from \$4.85 to \$5.85 an hour. Their own union admitted they had to take a substandard contract not because they liked it but because of the threat they might lose their jobs.

It has been two months since they signed the contract. Now they find the contract has been sold to another cleaning firm. That firm will not take any of the women. If it does, the women will start at an even lower rate. Successor rights do not exist in a situation like that when a contract is sold out. I think it bothered the Minister of Labour and he had a meeting with them subsequently.

My colleague the member for Scarborough West (Mr. R. F. Johnston) raised an instance of the same thing happening in one of the nursing homes in the west end of the city of Toronto. Eight women were drawing a wage of between \$6 and \$8.05 an hour. That was the top rate in that nursing home. Once again, after they negotiated their last contract, the company said: "Hey, that is too rich for us." So it sold the contract to another outfit.

The other outfit was not going to offer any of them jobs at first, although they could have used some of them. Those women had up to 14 years in that nursing home. The company said it would take them on if they wanted to work for \$4.50 an hour. Some of them went to work for that company because they were desperate for jobs. But of the eight women who sat in the gallery here the other day when my colleague raised the matter, one of them got 10 days of work, one got a week and another got three days. They also happened to be the key people in the union who had negotiated the last contract.

Three of them got a minimum amount of work in the two months since this happened. They came to us in frustration and said: "We know there is not much you can do to get our jobs back. We think what is going on is lousy so will you at least raise this matter in the House?" That is why we raised it.

I did not dig up the comments, which were pretty light, from the other side of the House, although I should have. I am pretty sure the government was not aware the eight women were sitting in the gallery. The eight had gone through a hell of a rough time and even at \$4.50 an hour were not going to be taken on by the outfit that had bought out the contract.

So in some ways they were in the same position as the Portuguese cleaning women at the Eaton Centre. They have nothing, and they had settled for only \$4.85 to \$5.85 an hour. These women, because they had shown some gumption and fight, were not even getting back in at \$4.50 an hour where they had been making from \$6 to \$8.05 an hour. That was the top rate in that nursing home.

This is happening to workers right across Ontario. The government can do what it likes about the market, the problems we are in, but it cannot escape some of the responsibility for what is happening. It must share the responsibility when it brings in the kinds of bills it does, such as the restraint bill. When it brings in the kind of budget we had presented in this House—it was lousy in terms of jobs for people—then you, Mr. Speaker, and your colleagues are directly responsible for some of those things that are happening to workers in Ontario. It is time we realized this is not the way out of the dilemma we are in. It is not going to give people very much hope.

Considering some of the disputes we are having I might take a few excerpts out of that 69-page decision of the Ontario Labour Relations Board, depending on how long I want to

talk today. I have been around the labour movement for a long time. I do not think I have ever seen as devastating an indictment as that board decision.

4:10 p.m.

It really makes one wonder when one sees workers treated the way they have been treated. I am talking now about the Automotive Hardware Ltd. strike that went on for six and a half months, from 1981 to 1982. We will go from that to a few of the situations we have today.

One sees the workers undermined. One sees an undercover person hired by the company on recommendation of Securicor, after the employer decided to bring them in several weeks prior to the strike. One sees his reports and his specific instructions to keep away from certain people but to get close to the local union president. He is seen being criticized because he got away from them. He got a little too active with a couple of the dissident groups he had worked on himself within that local situation, and was told to go back and get next to the president so they would know exactly what was going on.

One sees him counselling theft on two occasions, something even he did not deny when it was finally before the board, by the president of the local. The president was smart enough not to take him up on it, although for a while he thought he was a good, loyal, hard-working and responsible member of the local union in a tough strike situation. In his reports a number of weeks later he says, "Hey, we did not succeed in getting him to steal, but I know now how we can nail the president of the local." That is the exact expression he used and submitted to Securicor and to the company.

One sees that kind of activity and sees that kind of person leading the way and throwing eggs, tomatoes and rocks. One sees him suggesting they grease the wheels of the tracks, or tear up the tracks going into the plant. One sees him moving around with a petition, the wording of which he got changed by the company itself, to try to get the union decertified while this dispute was going on.

One sees all of these kinds of rotten, stinking activities and knows the Metro Toronto Police and the Ontario Provincial Police were aware of the agent provocateur and what was going on in that plant. We have been raising it for a year and a half or two years with the Minister of Labour and this government. One wonders at the further undermining of the rights—not so much the rights as the hopes, aspirations, or faith in the system on the part of working people in Ontario.

They are the ones the government wants to call on for its restraint programs, for its minimum wage make-work programs, for its no-concrete-action in terms of our loss of branch plants or corporate rationalization.

Sooner or later a majority of the people, I do not know when it will come but they are going to get so bloody wise to the government we are going to have real trouble in this province, in this country of ours. Somebody over there better start thinking in terms of ordinary people.

Not only is that what happened, it brought about this decision. I doubt they will but I wish every member of this House, and in particular every Tory and Liberal member, would read this 69-page decision to give them some feeling or some idea of what was going on in that situation.

One moves from there to what is being done to the women cleaners in the Eaton Centre, to what is being done to some of them in the nursing homes and to what is currently going on in the Central Precision Ltd. strike, where it is also a group of new Canadians; once again, a lot though not all of them, are Portuguese workers. And what do we have in that situation?

I am not going to go through the "up yours," the arm signals and the deliberate provocation that has been introduced by the Securicor people in that particular strike, or the fact that one of their proud boasts to the workers on the picket line is: "Keep it up as long as you want. We do not even care if you scratch the odd side of a car because it is all on our bill. The longer you are out on strike, the longer we are going to make \$20,000 per week."

The members may recall when we raised in this House that the evidence before the Ontario Labour Relations Board was that in the Canada Cement strike their bill was over \$600,000. I think it was \$697,000 this firm collected. There is big money in this kind of dirty activity.

The workers wonder why there is this deliberate provocation on the part of the security outfit. They wonder why everything they do is photographed with a movie camera. They wonder why the deliberate provocation takes place on the picket line. One or two of them do get caught kicking the side of a car or something.

Their jobs are at stake. Some of the charges are not legitimate but some are; those in the mischief field—I have never denied that in this House—things done under severe provocation. I wonder why this security firm is able to go down to a local justice of the peace and swear

out an arrest warrant when that same justice would not take it from the union.

Then—not immediately, in one case over two weeks later—suddenly the local police force arrives on the picket line and starts arresting the workers on that line. On April 6, four of them, including the local union president, were arrested. The police conveniently arrived exactly at the time when the vans were there to take the strikebreakers through the line. In the course of some 27 charges, they finally accepted one from the union over a couple of workers who were hit by one of the vans going through the line too fast and whom we had to take down to the hospital. They have now arrested 27 of the workers and forbidden them to appear within so many hundred feet of that picket line. That is almost the entire leadership in that plant.

I do not know how they can get more deliberate in their provocation, their undermining of the rights the Ontario Labour Relations Act says all workers have to organize and to conduct free collective bargaining. There should be a lesson that Tories, of all people, should learn. In a Communist system—Roy Reuther taught me this in the year and a half I had the privilege of working on his staff before he died; Roy and Walter Reuther were involved, but I worked directly for Roy—the first people who are undermined or who disappear in a totalitarian system are the workers and their organizations. Communists are very good at that. Conservatives are not very far behind them in undermining workers and their organizations.

The member can do a little bit of smiling up there—

Mr. Kells: That is allowed.

Mr. Mackenzie: He should read that and then tell me how he defends what has gone on in this province.

So we now have a picket line that has pretty well been decimated in a legal strike situation. They went through this before, 11 years ago, with Canadian Driver Pool and Richard Grange, about as rotten an outfit as we had in the business at that time. I wonder why this is allowed? If nothing else gets through to the Tory members, surely when somebody goes there and meets with them or meets with some of the families, as I have done, they crowd around and ask: "How can this happen here? Why, when we have a legal strike situation, have we got to take on not only the company but also Securicor, the security outfit, and the police?"

They want desperately to believe and trust in the institutions we have, but they are losing faith

rapidly. Joe Pierro was phoned and told he was the 27th; they had a warrant for him. He was not picked up in the picket line. When he came down to the station at the request of the local union president the first thing they did—and it was only a mischief charge—was to slap handcuffs on him. We heard that from some of the family. Where is the fairness? How can they do it?

I have had them say to me on that line: "Mr. Mackenzie, after we have had our morning confrontation, why is it that a couple of hours later those cars that have been whirling the cameras on the picket line when there was some trouble—we had the volatile situation the board talks about, and a strike is always dangerous enough without the deliberate provocations that are made by a firm like Securicor—shoot out of the lot, go across the street and park beside the police car? They roll down the windows and talk and smoke for an hour or two. Whose side are they on? How can we expect some justice in this system?"

I think there is something here a lot of members of this House should be worried about. There is enough cynicism about politicians generally as it is. I guess all of us to some extent are responsible for some of the things we do or try to do or do not do. I am perfectly willing to take my share of the blame in that area. But when we let either bad law, misuse of the law or refusal to uphold the law begin to destroy people's faith in the system—the faith of workers and new Canadians in particular—when we start letting that happen, we are on a slippery slope. We had better start worrying about it. It worries me, and it is an honest and sincere worry.

I do not like what is happening. It scares the literal hell out of me. I do not know why it is so hard to get through to people that maybe some of the things they are doing require a second look.

4:20 p.m.

I noted with interest that Douglas Fraser is resigning at the convention they are having down in Dallas right now. Unlike some, knowing the internal United Automobile Workers politics I come out of, I would have voted for Leonard Woodcock for the first term, but a person I have a lot of respect for, Walter Reuther, really thought Douglas Fraser was probably his immediate replacement. Douglas Fraser is resigning. It is unfortunate for the international union, the United Automobile Workers. I think the story in this morning's

Globe and Mail underlines to some extent the very concerns I have been raising in my few remarks in the House today.

Some of his comments follow. I raise them because they tie into the point I want to make in terms of whether we have to decide to protect some of the basic industry in this province of ours. The Globe's story says: "The very life of the North American auto industry is threatened by the tide of Japanese imports. An equal threat to employment of US and Canadian auto workers is posed by production outside Canada and the United States of components for vehicles assembled in North America."

"In his keynote speech to the 2,800 delegates, Mr. Fraser said that he hoped that the union's collective bargaining convention next March will focus on bringing more democracy into labour relations in the United States and Canada, because unions can no longer afford merely to protest against company decisions."

"Workers must have a greater voice in their own destiny, said Mr. Fraser, who is a member of the board of directors of Chrysler Corp. Mr. Fraser noted that more than 40 per cent of UAW members in Canadian independent parts plants have been laid off."

He noted also, talking about recovery, "Although car sales in the United States increased by 7.2 per cent in the first four months of this year over the same period last year, the current rate, if carried to the end of the year, would still leave US sales 2.5 million behind 1978." He said that in Canada, where the sales have been up 14.5 per cent in the past few months, they are still 41 per cent below 1979.

I think the key point here is: "Mr. Fraser said more than ever before the union's priorities, such as local content regulations, require action in Washington and Ottawa. By 1984, the North American car makers plan to import two million engines and transmissions for North American cars, he said. The union is campaigning for legislation in both countries to require a specified percentage of Canadian and US content in imported cars."

He also said, and this is interesting, that the union's lobbying in the United States House of Representatives had resulted in its adopting domestic content legislation. We all should have a little bit of warning on this. Once again we are following the pack. When we talk about Ontario, we never lead in Ontario, we are following the pack. They moved to that extent. Unfortunately, before the Senate could deal with it, it died because of the election. They

hope to reintroduce it. They had moved so far as actually to get that through the House of Representatives.

Mr. Fraser went on to say that we cannot sacrifice "auto workers' jobs on the altar of free trade. 'The very foundations of metalworking industries are now threatened as the result of the not-so-benign neglect by conservative leaders.'"

There is more to the story and it is one well worth reading. It underlines one of the points we have made. We are not so naïve as to think the answer is in here. It is the simplified response to what we say in this House that annoys me as much as anything. We are not so blind as to think we do not have to trade and do not have to sell.

We have let ourselves get sucked into believing that it is only because we can sell our raw materials in this great country of ours to the extent that we do that we are really keeping our economy as healthy as it is. We cannot get sucked into thinking we have to go the total free trade route. We cannot get sucked into thinking we can do a total protection job. It is pretty obvious in this country of ours that we have to be selective. We have to take a look at where the jobs are. That has never been the first consideration. It has been what benefits the company, the trickle-down theory that is all the way through this budget.

For once we have to start taking a look at where the jobs are and at the industries in which we have the expertise. Have we done the production in the past? Do we still have the production capability?

I do not know better examples—I suppose I should use a machinery or parts example—but, as I have done a number of times, I will fall back on our food industry and the fact that it was only about 30 years ago in Ontario that we canned about 70 per cent of all the peaches and tomatoes we ate. Today we are down to less than 30 per cent. We might have got those a penny or two cheaper at the time we allowed them to sell out the industry. Once we have lost the productive capacity, we can no longer set the prices and we are probably paying through the nose for it now.

When that started, the big boost was Del Monte's buy-out of Canadian Cannerys, and they shut down about 32 of the 37 canning plants in Ontario over a very few years. We are now importing something when even Liberal and Tory agriculture ministers say we could can 100 per cent of our needs. We cannot supply it,

because of our climate, other than during our limited fresh market season, but we sure could can everything we need. Instead, we are importing 70 per cent of it.

If we take that into machinery and into the refining of the raw materials, which we do not do, into almost anything in the industrial sector, we will find the priority of this government or of the federal government is not whether we can do it and do it well, but whether the company, the conglomerate, big or small, can do it better and cheaper through free enterprise and private enterprise means. In other words, they make the decisions.

We have to look after our order books and be able to move our plants, the president of Consolidated-Bathurst told us. That does not take into consideration what we are doing to the workers in that operation. It seems to me we have to be selective. We have to take a look at a little self-sufficiency in some of the industrial areas where we do have the ability to compete and do well.

If some assistance is needed, perhaps those are the areas we should be looking at. Maybe we should be looking at some protection in those areas. By being selective, perhaps we can also be sure we do not get into something where we know we simply cannot compete.

I have a suspicion the argument that the rest of the world will not buy our products if we do not buy all their manufactured goods is not necessarily totally true, because our products—our raw materials, power, food, minerals, wood—are things that are needed around the world. It seems to me we have not been good managers, good organizers or good in terms of getting our share; nor have we been best at working out a fair and good business deal in our country.

I repeat, the one thing we have never brought into the equation is the workers. Sooner or later, we have to decide that some of the future in this province is going to be in deciding that our priority is seeing that people have work, or we had better move like hell in deciding how we will be able to redistribute some of the earnings and some of the productive capacity of our plants, because that is our problem.

I see a budget that does not deal with that kind of situation and a government that is not taking a look at something like content legislation. I do not know whether it is correct to say he laughed at us, but I still recall some of the arguments we had across the floor on that issue from the member for St. Andrew-St Patrick (Mr. Grossman) when he was the minister, and

which we still get from the present Minister of Industry and Trade (Mr. Walker).

One would think we were raising something that would destroy the whole system when we were talking about content legislation. How else are we going to protect a foot in the door, never mind a window on the industry, if we do not decide we are going to go the route of content legislation?

In allowing branch plants to come in to supply a Canadian market, we must set down some rules so that for as long as they are here they have an obligation to the workers they hire, an obligation beyond the time they are here if they arbitrarily decide to close down a plant because they can do it cheaper in the United States, Brazil, Europe or some other country.

4:30 p.m.

They also have an obligation to do research and development. All of us in the House, New Democrats, Liberals and Tories, know that we are almost at the bottom of the western industrial world when it comes to the percentage that is spent on research and development, which is where spinoff jobs come from. There are reasons for that too. Such a large percentage of the industry in our branch plant economy now is foreign-controlled that the foreign owners make the decisions. The plants are here in many cases to supply a narrow Canadian market, and they do not do the research and development, nor are they required to.

When we also run into, as we did in the plant shutdown committee—and we have raised this time and again, but it does not seem to get through to people—some companies that have branch plants operating here, once again to supply a Canadian market, but they are even forbidden to compete on the export markets of the world, we understand the decisions that are being made and we realize that maybe those branch plants were not worth the price of getting them. Certainly the decisions that are being made are not conducive to any guarantees of employment for Canadian workers.

We simply must have legislation that sets some rules: "You are going to have a responsibility to the workers involved. You are going to do some research and development in this country. You are going to let your branch plants compete on world markets so that we have some chance of catching some of the spinoff benefits that are in the content legislation and of getting probably a better tax structure than we have at this time."

Our laws are going to have to recognize at

least fundamental rights of workers, which are being undermined, and that there is some modicum of responsibility for workers such as the 45 women at the Eaton Centre who, two months after they had signed a new contract, were told arbitrarily that they were no longer wanted.

Those are not radical, wild or unworthy suggestions. They are suggestions that put the wants, aspirations and needs of our people a little higher up the ladder than they seem to be today in Ontario and in this country of ours. There is a desperate need to turn some of our priorities around. There is a desperate need to reach out to the people and say, "One of the things has got to be an effort to provide some security that does not exist today." We have to respond to that desperate desire for security.

Many little things have bothered the heck out of me in recent days. One of them is the argument I had back and forth with the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Elgie) and the Minister of Labour (Mr. Ramsay) over pensions. It has taken us 10 or 15 years to establish that negotiated pension plans are deferred wages. As a matter of fact, I thought that even the Tories had finally accepted that argument.

Then we had the recent example in Toronto where a small firm went belly up and ended up having a substantial surplus in its pension fund. They had \$1.5 million in it, and about \$1,020,000 would have funded the workers who were there. But what happened? That principle of deferred wages and workers' rights did not mean a thing in this plant. The legislation does not cover it, we find. The company that went belly up will not get it—some of its creditors will, some of the banks and trust companies—but the \$500,000 surplus in that fund went right into the debts of that company.

Even little things we thought we had won in this province are not secure today.

This budget does not deal with any of the questions I have raised. It does not deal with some of the suggestions we have made and others will make.

I do not know of any single way in which the government could provide additional jobs more quickly and do more for our economy than through housing. Last year this budget said we were trying to create 38,000 jobs in the housing field, but what is in the budget this year? All of 12,000. By golly, what are we doing? That is one area that everybody admits has the quickest payout. If the money had been put into that,

those people would be working; they would come off the unemployment rolls and pay taxes and we would not have the kind of increasing deficit situation we have in the province.

Surely to goodness we could take a look at sufficiency, content legislation, protecting some of our existing industries, capital works that have some meaning, housing, and probably more assistance to the various lower-income people in our province, which is also not in this budget.

I do not know many people who are on mother's allowance, the guaranteed annual income system or a pension with nothing to go with it, who do not spend just about every cent they get. There are a few who are better off, but anything they get they will use to purchase things. At least that has the potential to help our economy. But we are giving them nothing to meet the increased costs they are facing.

Almost everything we are doing in this budget does not make a heck of a lot of sense but, most of all, it does not meet or try to meet the needs of the people of this province. There is no way I can have any confidence in it. There is no way I can have any confidence in a government that brought this kind of document into this House. There is no way I see it doing a heck of a lot to restore a little trust, faith and hope in the citizens of this province.

I guess it is hopeless, but I really hope the members of the government party will take a look at the road they are taking us down; they may have the numbers now, but I am not sure those will stay with them when the people finally realize how thoroughly they are being taken in this budget.

Mr. Kells: Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity—

Mr. Di Santo: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: I see we have only one minister sitting on the government benches and only 6.7 per cent of the members of the Conservative caucus. We do not have a quorum in the House. We would like to have an audience.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Cousens): Are you asking for a quorum call?

Mr. Di Santo: Yes.

The Acting Speaker: Is there a quorum?

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, may I—

The Acting Speaker: It is not a point of order about whether a minister is on duty or not.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: This is not about that.

The Acting Speaker: Before we take the count.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, I was here on Friday morning, at which time there were two members of the New Democratic Party and two members of the Liberal Party present in the House for the entire budget debate.

The Acting Speaker: Thank you. That initial part of his point of order—he got distracted. Is there a quorum?

Interjections.

The Acting Speaker ordered the bells to be rung.

4:42 p.m.

Mr. Kells: Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for Downsview (Mr. Di Santo) for attracting a crowd.

I welcome the opportunity to participate in this debate on the budgetary policy of the government and the policies and programs contained in the 1983 budget of Ontario.

Two other provinces, Quebec and New Brunswick, brought down budgets at about the same time as Ontario, Quebec on the same day and New Brunswick on May 6. I believe a comparative survey of the budgetary measures introduced by those provinces would help us put Ontario's budget and the budgetary policies of this government into perspective.

In its May 6 budget, New Brunswick increased its sales tax from eight per cent to 10 per cent. At the same time the province extended its retail sales tax base to include labour done on personal property. The Quebec budget leaves that province's retail sales tax rate at nine per cent. Last year that government increased its retail sales tax rate from eight to nine per cent, supposedly for a temporary 10-month period. Now apparently it has found it cannot afford to forgo the revenue it would lose through a one per cent reduction in the retail sales tax rate. In Ontario our sales tax rate remains at seven per cent.

The expansion of the retail sales tax effected by the 1982 budget has not had the disastrous impact on our economy that was predicted by some parties. Events have proven correct the conclusion of the Treasurer that in a very sensitive economic environment the expansion of the sales tax base presented the best method of raising revenues needed to support our social programs.

Because of this government's record of sound financial management, we have been able to use

the retail sales tax system as a stimulative instrument without endangering either delivery of services or our financial stability. Between the fiscal years 1975-76 and 1981-82, we have used the sales tax system to provide incentives to the automobile industry, the hospitality industry, the tourist industry and the home appliance industry, to name a few. The total cost of these measures to the province has been pretty close to \$1.7 billion.

In the 1983 budget our government indicates it will again use the sales tax to support specific sectors of our economy. The exemption on sales of production machinery and equipment has been expanded and a 90-day tax holiday has been granted on purchases of new household furniture and appliances. Total cost of these two programs is estimated at \$150 million. This brings the grand total for this type of program to almost \$1.8 billion. That is a lot of stimulation and a lot of jobs created and protected.

Let us now turn our attention to another major provincial revenue source—the gasoline and motor fuel tax—and see how the three provinces compare.

In its May 6 budget New Brunswick increased its gasoline tax from 16 to 20 per cent of the pump price, raising the price of a litre of regular leaded gas by 1.6 cents. The Quebec budget left the gas tax unchanged; I call members' attention to the fact that it remains at a full 40 per cent of the retail price. In the last survey available to me, this tax amounted to 15.2 per cents per litre of regular leaded gas, 16.4 cents on regular unleaded gas and 16.8 cents on premium gasoline.

In explaining why he did not reduce the gas tax, Mr. Parizeau, the Quebec Minister of Finance, noted that the tax had brought in \$600 million in revenue in 1983. I quote: "There is no way in which we can let such an amount go uncollected at this point."

In Ontario, in March, this government actually reduced the provincial tax on gasoline. That reduction left the provincial tax rate at 7.3 cents per litre for regular, 7.7 cents for unleaded and 7.9 cents for premium.

Let members compare the Quebec and Ontario rates of 40 per cent and 20 per cent respectively and then decide where they would prefer to fuel up.

I mention these two taxes because they have a direct and immediate impact on the consumer. Critics argue that certain policies of this government militate against the consumer-led recovery. These claims are questionable in them-

selves and ignore the fact that this government's ability to hold the line on the sales tax and the gasoline tax has and does increase consumer purchasing power.

Much the same can be said of the provincial and personal income tax. The New Brunswick budget increased that province's income tax from 55.5 per cent of the federal tax to 58 per cent. The Quebec rate is 52.7 per cent. The Ontario rate—the third lowest in the country—stands at 48 per cent.

Some criticism has been directed against the five per cent surcharge on personal income tax that was introduced by this budget. This tax, which is a temporary measure only, will produce \$170 million in this fiscal year. This revenue will be used to help pay for the job creation programs outlined in the budget and will help finance the social support programs on which many of our citizens depend.

Few would argue that a temporary five per cent surcharge is preferable to an increase in the actual tax rate. Furthermore, I am certain most Ontarians, given the choice between a small surcharge or a decline in the level and quality of services, or the choice between a temporary surcharge or increased government borrowing, would select the surcharge.

To conclude this brief but I hope illuminating comparative survey, let us take a look at the relative financial positions of the three provinces as outlined by their budgets.

The tax increases introduced by the New Brunswick budget, including those I mentioned and others such as a special levy on municipal tax rates, an increase in the property tax, the introduction of a property transfer tax and the reintroduction of hospital user fees, were part of that government's effort to control the ever-expanding deficit on its current account. In addition to these measures designed to raise new revenue, that province as a restraint measure has asked its public sector employees to accept a one-year wage freeze.

As a result of these measures the New Brunswick government hopes to be able to hold its 1983 deficit at \$190.6 million. However, had it not taken such forceful action to raise new revenues and control expenditures, the deficit was projected to reach \$381 million in 1983 and to escalate to \$466 million in the fiscal year 1984-85.

I am sure all members will agree that the New Brunswick measures are strong indeed. However, according to the New Brunswick Minister of Finance, they were necessary because the defi-

cit in the province was not the product of cyclical factors that would vanish with the recession. Rather, the deficit has become a deeply rooted structural problem arising from an ingrained expenditure level that was growing faster than revenues.

4:50 p.m.

In its 1982-83 budget, the Quebec government estimated its deficit for the year would be \$2.98 billion. In fact, the estimate was revised upward in November 1982 to \$3.2 billion. Again this year the Quebec deficit will be in the \$3.2-billion range and it is likely to remain at that level for the next few years.

One consequence of this high deficit has been that Quebec has had its debt instruments downgraded. As a result, neither the province nor its crown corporations can borrow at the most favourable available market rates.

By comparison, the deficit in Ontario, thanks to a long-standing commitment to restraint and expenditure control, has not become institutionalized and is not built into our financial system. Most of the deficit in this province is due to the effects of the recession and will be gradually eliminated as the economy recovers.

Ontario's per capita deficit stands at about \$293, the lowest among any of the provinces. In addition, our deficit relative to our gross domestic product is also the lowest of any Canadian province.

Mr. Kerrio: There shouldn't be any. We're the richest province. What are you boasting about?

Mr. Kells: Just wait until I get to the comparisons with the federal government.

At the national level, despite the fact that the Canadian economy is less than three times the size of Ontario's, the federal deficit of \$31.2 billion is more than 10 times the size of Ontario's deficit.

An. hon. member: Big deal.

Mr. Kells: It is quite a big deal. It is no accident that this province finds itself in such an enviable financial position. It is a result of this government's long-standing commitment to, and the practice of a cost-efficient delivery of, services and restraint.

No province in Canada has been able to escape the negative impact of the recession on its economy. Even Alberta with its oil riches is now facing a deficit of between \$2.2 billion and \$2.4 billion and unemployment rates approaching the national average.

Few provinces have been able to cope with

the recession as effectively as Ontario. The degree of flexibility afforded our Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) because of our past management practices enabled us to expand our spending in response to the recession and thereby help the people of the province through a very rough economic period. We were able to do this without undermining the long-term growth prospects for the province and without burdening the people of this province with higher taxes.

Furthermore, Ontario now finds itself in a position to take full advantage of improving economic conditions. In all probability, Ontario will rebound more quickly from the recession than any other province. In large measure this is because of the budgetary policies of this government, which will help to accelerate the recovery through sensitive stimulation of those sectors of our economy on which recovery must be built. In part it is also because of our diversified economic base, in which upturns in one sector can lead to recovery in others.

We will also benefit from the fact that we are a trading province. Improvements in the economies of our major trading partners will redound to our advantage in the form of increased export sales.

This budget puts in place the policies that will help our private sector take full advantage of improving conditions. It puts in place the programs that will help our industries increase their productivity and thereby compete more effectively in the domestic and international marketplace.

Every province was hit by the recession; every province is now attempting to pull out of that recession and encourage recovery. In most cases they are attempting to do this through policies that restrain public sector expenditures and encourage private sector growth. Nine of the 10 provinces have introduced official restraint programs. None of these programs has been, in my opinion, as equitable or as effective as Ontario's inflation restraint program.

All the provinces are looking to the private sector as the main engine of recovery. As the Quebec Minister of Finance pointed out, "The essence of our efforts must be on job creation and economic recovery, and that requires serious support from the private sector." If that sounds familiar to the members, it should. It is precisely what our Treasurer said in his budget address to this House. It is precisely what this budget and last year's budget have been working towards.

I have conducted this brief survey to help put Ontario's budgetary policies, its fiscal position and the claims of the members opposite into perspective. I believe, and any member who can for a moment rise above the limitations imposed by partisan prejudice will agree with me, that this survey demonstrates that we in Ontario are in a most fortunate position. The simple truth is that this is a well-managed province and that we are much better off than many of the members opposite would like to believe.

In Ontario we have what is referred to as a mixed economy. This administration has long acknowledged that government does have a positive role to play in the economy. We have never subscribed to the view that one must choose between economic progress and social justice, and that the former can only be achieved through a laissez-faire market and the latter through massive state intervention and economic centralization.

On the contrary, we have always held that an economic progress which does not increase social equity is not progress and that social progress must involve economic justice. Our commitment to these principles is reflected in our budgetary policy. As this budget makes clear, this government will continue to participate constructively in the economic life of the province as it is its responsibility to do.

In this case, our contribution will continue to be made on two broad fronts: first, through policies designed to stimulate job creation and economic development, and second, in the delivery of fundamental social support services to the people of the province.

This government has met these responsibilities and, as this budget makes clear, will continue to do so. We have always acted with sensible restraint. We have done so, not, as some would have one believe, out of any mean-heartedness or lack of concern, but because we recognize that neither the immediate nor long-term interests of the people of this province are served by policies which would squander our resources and ransom our future.

This government has resisted the urgings of those who would substitute destructive interference for constructive intervention. This government has always considered it was its responsibility to encourage real growth, not the illusion of growth. The 1983 budget will help us meet that responsibility.

This government has the confidence of the people. It has won that confidence because it

has taken a pragmatic, moderate approach to governing; it has consistently produced policies and programs which have not only dealt efficiently and effectively with the problems facing Ontarians, but also have been progressive and farsighted, so that Ontario has been always in a position to take advantage of new opportunities.

In our approach to government we have rejected extremism. While adherence to extreme positions may make policy-making easy, it does not make policies effective. Rather than content ourselves or betray the people of this province with simplistic solutions to complex problems, we have attempted to base our policies on a sound and thorough analysis of the issues and on a reasoned accommodation of the legitimate interests of all the parties involved in a given situation.

The budget demonstrates this moderate, pragmatic approach to the management of the province will be continued. In my opinion, it would be disastrous to depart from that at this time. It is essential that in the coming crucial months we deal with things as they are and not with some fantasy of things as we would wish them to be.

Our record shows that by adopting this pragmatic and moderate approach we have been able to provide the people of Ontario with good, inexpensive and responsible government. I am certain this record will be continued and the confidence which the people have in this government will be vindicated.

Likewise, this government has confidence in the abilities of the people of this province, and has faith in their willingness to work to build a better future.

It is imperative that during this time of recovery the mutual confidence and trust, which is the foundation of the partnership between this government and the citizens it serves, be maintained. The road back from the recession will not be short, nor will it be easy, but it is a road which, if we are to travel it at all, we must travel together.

In closing, I would urge all members to support the programs and policies outlined in the budget, programs that reflect our appreciation of, and will deal effectively with the challenges which face this province.

Mr. Wrye: Mr. Speaker, I would start by saying that this is one honourable member who will not support a budget that is not worthy of support.

Mr. Treleaven: Is that the speech?

Mr. Wrye: I will take a little bit of time because I see my friend the member for Oxford (Mr. Treleaven) is here and he is seeking ways to support the budget. He will hear very little of that in this speech because I could find very little that would receive the support, the applause or in any way, the approval of my constituents.

5 p.m.

When I went into the lockup last Tuesday, it was not the first time I had been in a budget lockup. In my previous incarnation as a journalist I had occasion on three budgets to go into the lockup and study the proposals of previous Treasurers of this government. One of the things that struck me immediately, and strikes me even more as I reread this document, is how simplistic it is, how little vision and foresight is contained in it. It could have been written on the back of an envelope for all the quality and imagination contained therein. The Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) spent more time repeating the same things time and again than he did outlining any programs.

This is a budget with no vision, no charting of a course for Ontario for the 1980s and 1990s. It is a budget completely devoid of any long-term strategy. Perhaps that is because we are not close enough to an election to be tantalized with the kind of economic gobbledegook that featured the Board of Industrial Leadership and Development program, which was brought in just days before the last campaign. There is certainly no vision in this budget; there is no recognition that Ontario, as an industrial giant in Canada, is in desperate trouble and needs the support, the encouragement, the enthusiasm and the financial backing of this government to get out of the mess this government has got us in.

There are a handful of short-term jobs in this budget; not enough. There are a few, and I will not deny it. Many of them are jobs where the Treasurer has simply hooked his railway car on to the job creation programs of Mr. Lalonde. There are no proposals and no plans for medium-term job creation, and I doubt that this government has given any thought to what long-term job creation and a long-term industrial strategy to take us through the rest of the century even would mean. This government thinks only in terms of the next election. That comes through very clearly in this budget.

What also comes through very clearly is what we can hope for. The people of this province—and of my community, who have faced unem-

ployment of around 20 per cent for some two or three years—can hope for no relief in the year to come. It is nothing short of a disgrace for this government, with a smile on its face, to suggest that while the labour force will grow by 56,000 this year, the number of those employed will actually shrink by 37,000. It is a disgrace that this government has come before this House with what it considers to be a budget to put Ontario back on the road to economic recovery, with a budget that, having said that, presents the people of Ontario with an unemployment rate over 1983 of 11.7 per cent.

There are many things wrong with this budget. First, I want to deal with how some of the voodoo economics of this Treasurer came about. I noted the previous speaker alluded to just how proud this province's deficit record was. It is not hard to get a deficit down to \$2.7 billion and to hang it all on the feds when federal transfers once again this year rose by 14.2 per cent. That is a little over inflation; about double. But that is because Ottawa has recognized the depth of the recession and has said it will take a short-term deficit, a large deficit, in order to allow the provinces—Ontario and the other nine provinces in this great country—to be able to deliver the social services this country so desperately needs at this time; to be able to deliver health care to those who cannot afford it; to be able to deliver family maintenance to those who, for one reason or another, need it.

The federal government properly recognized that. While it maintained in its sphere of jurisdiction the control over the unemployment insurance program, it said, "The provinces, and the municipalities as creatures of the province, will need help as well so we will transfer to them a significant amount of money"—an amount of money which, as I mentioned earlier, is approximately double the rate of inflation.

So this year the federal government transferred a total of \$3.759 billion, up almost \$500 million from last year. I am sure it did so in the expectation that Ontario would choose to be just as generous to its municipalities and school boards; yet the opposite has been the case. This province, in order to protect its triple-A credit rating, in order to brag about how low its deficit is in comparison with those of everybody else, has shafted the municipalities once again and has given them 6.8 per cent.

Interjections.

Mr. Wrye: My friends, the members for Nipissing (Mr. Harris) and Durham-York (Mr. Stevenson), indicate that we ought to be thankful.

Later in my speech I will read into the record, for the member for Nipissing, a letter from the mayor of the municipality of North Bay which tells just how thankful the people and the council of North Bay are for the fact that the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Mr. Bennett), in his always infinite wisdom, scrapped one of the most effective programs for low-income families that this province has had—a program that the minister himself termed a success. I suppose that is why he scrubbed it. I'll bet he did not scrub any of the self-congratulatory advertising he would do.

So this year the provincial government has turned 6.8 per cent more over to the municipalities. In this budget it could have increased—and it did not—its share of the welfare payments from 30 per cent to 40 per cent for those municipalities which are hard-hit and struggling; municipalities such as mine, those of the members for Sudbury (Mr. Gordon), Chatham-Kent (Mr. Watson) and Brantford (Mr. Gillies).

It is amazing how many of those really effective Tory members did not get anything for their municipalities. Maybe the people ought to know just how effective they all are as well. It is said that the opposition members can never get anything. That seems ironic since it appears that the Tory members do not get much either. I suppose they do not get much because there is so very little understanding of the real crisis faced by municipalities today.

I want to turn to two of the other horrible measures in this budget. First, the increase of five per cent in the Ontario health insurance plan premiums. This is a new increase which brings the increase in OHIP premiums—and I hope my friends over there take note of it because they are all going to hear about it during the next election campaign—since the people of Ontario decided to let the Premier (Mr. Davis) keep the promise, up to 42 per cent in two years and two months.

One of the promises of the Davis government was to keep taxes low. I suppose all government members will go out on the hustings and suggest to the people that OHIP premiums are not really a tax. What a ridiculous suggestion that is.

Our party has made our position on the premiums very, very clear.

Mr. Foulds: I thought your leader said five per cent was okay.

Mr. Wrye: Unfortunately, I am going to have to digress for a moment to respond to my friend from the New Democratic Party. The leader of the Ontario Liberal Party, if the member will

check, suggested that if the increase was over five per cent, there could be a court challenge to it. However, if the deputy leader of the New Democratic Party would like, I will send him a copy of the Liberal task force report, *On the Critical List*, for his perusal and enjoyment.

5:10 p.m.

He will find the position of the party, a position which has not changed for many years, is that OHIP premiums should be, and should have been in this budget, frozen at their present level and a phase-out period should begin, a phase-out period we believe would take four to five years.

Mr. Foulds: Your leader agrees with that, does he?

Mr. Wrye: The leader is in absolute agreement with that position.

Mr. Foulds: Five per cent is okay. You can freeze that.

Mr. Wrye: No, I will not explain it for him again. He can go back and read Hansard. The member is obviously a slow learner. I would suggest—

Mr. Foulds: I would sure be a slow learner when it comes to Liberal economics.

Mr. Wrye: I suggest perhaps he might want to go back and reread that.

Interjections.

Mr. Wrye: The point is what has happened in this budget, and I hate to argue with my friends from the left, but they have become so irrelevant in Ontario politics, and so irrelevant in national politics that they fear for their very survival as a viable party in the next election.

Mr. Foulds: How many seats do you have in northern Ontario?

Mr. Mackenzie: That is what we heard in Hamilton West, too.

Mr. Foulds: Look at Hamilton West and York South.

Mr. Mackenzie: It was the Liberals who were irrelevant.

Mr. Kerrio: Are you talking about British Columbia?

Mr. Wrye: We will not talk about BC and we do not want to talk about Saskatchewan either. We will leave all that alone.

Mr. Foulds: How many Liberals or Tories are there left in British Columbia?

Mr. Wrye: I think we came back. We got three per cent of the vote.

The government likes to talk about the fact there is premium assistance. I am just delighted to see the Treasurer has included in this document under one of his appendices, "Premium assistance limits will continue as follows." Of course, when we get into limits for premium assistance we do not recognize there has been any inflation. Of course, inflation only goes on when it is for the government.

It says, "Free coverage: single persons having taxable incomes of \$3,000 or less; families having taxable incomes of \$3,500 or less." Well, is that not generous? In other words, if one has a wife and two children and is making somewhere around \$10,000 a year, one will qualify for premium assistance. If one is up around the massive, huge gross salary of \$16,000 or \$17,000 a year, one gets the rare privilege, unless one's employer covers it of course, of paying, I think, \$56.65 or \$56.70 a month. That adds up, in case the government has lost track, to \$700 a year of regressive, Robin Hood-in-reverse taxation.

If there is one matter that makes me, in a sense, even angrier than the OHIP increase, which I suppose is about all we could expect of this government, it is the personal income tax increase. What makes me honestly and genuinely angry about it is not so much the increase, but the name. I resent, my constituents resent and I think any honourable member of this House ought to resent the title "social services maintenance tax."

We suggested in the House the other day it should be called the "Suncor maintenance tax" or the "Minaki Lodge maintenance tax." In a sense, I guess that was good for a laugh, but I do not think entitling a personal tax increase with a title like "social services maintenance tax" is a laughing matter.

I deal in a riding where the unemployment rate is probably 25 per cent, where mother-led families are numerous and where there has been, and continues to be, a lot of real human misery. Somehow this title swipes out at those people in a very mean-spirited way. It says to the middle class, "Here you are: you are going to face another personal income tax increase and it is all to pay for health care, family benefits and the like."

Why do we not call it the road maintenance tax increase? I could make as logical an argument that that is what it is for. How do we know this is for social services maintenance? Why not call it the medical profession maintenance tax increase? They are getting \$250 million more

this year as a result of the agreement the government negotiated with them.

No, in this era of the rightward drift, the Tories think they can move to where Reagan is and a little further right, and in this way they will be the champions of the Canadian people. This is the title they want to put on the tax increase. I find that tax increase title reprehensible.

I cannot comment on whether it is temporary or not. I will simply note that we have had a number of temporary taxes over the years and most of them became permanent. We will wait until December 1984 to see whether this becomes permanent as well.

The interesting thing is the OHIP premium, which is a tax by any other name. Somehow seven provinces out of 10 manage to pay for their health care systems without premiums so they must be raising the money through taxes. Thus it follows the premiums we have are taxes by another name.

The combination of OHIP premiums and personal taxes now means we are effectively paying provincial taxes at a rate of 62 per cent of federal tax payable. That is just about the highest in the whole country. And what did one specific large group get for these tax increases which strike so hard at them? It did not strike so much at the very poor, because the government has let off the hook single people earning less than \$7,500 and families earning less than \$12,000. But what did that large group of people struggling along on gross incomes of \$15,000 to \$25,000 get?

One of the first things they got was a tax holiday on furniture and appliances. The other day I asked the Treasurer about this and he said to go and tell my constituents I am opposed to this tax holiday. I told him I already had—and I want to repeat it today. It is wrong-headed, it is just plain poor economics and it will create far fewer jobs than the \$55 million we will spend. My opposition to this may put me in a minority in this place, but I suspect we could have placed our dollars far better and I will explain why I do.

I want first to read into the record the comments of the Ontario Chamber of Commerce. This is a body I do not always agree with but on this one occasion I think its wisdom is great in what it had to say about this kind of tax holiday. In a brief to the Treasurer before the budget, which he should have reread when he was preparing it, they said:

"The Ontario chamber is opposed to any short-term stimuli to the economy such as a reduction or partial removal of Ontario retail

sales tax. Such a program would serve to reduce inventory rather than to create jobs, in that it brings forward purchases of items which would otherwise be bought at some point in the future.

"Where inventories are low, lowering Ontario retail sales tax could actually hurt the recovery more than help by creating short-term abnormal demands of the manufacturing sector, which may in turn spark instability and inflationary pressures."

5:20 p.m.

I want to add a few other suggestions why I think this move is ill-advised. First, I have looked at the list and there are some nice things in here that maybe I could use. I am employed. Maybe I could use a new sofa, or a hutch, or some floor coverings or a new freezer. But today many of my constituents cannot afford these things, which are essentially luxuries, because of the depth of the recession. What they need desperately is jobs so they can put food on the table, so they can repair their homes and have a decent roof over their heads, so they can go out and buy some clothes for their children and all of those necessities of life.

There is not much point in them going out and saving seven per cent when they buy a freezer if they do not have any food to put into that freezer, and for too many of my constituents that is the case.

The Treasurer and the government would argue that this kind of stimulus, as I understand the argument, will pull money out of the banks and out of the short-term certificates and get it back into the marketplace to stimulate the furniture and appliance business.

I would argue that this is already beginning to happen, and I would argue this as a member who comes from an automotive community that in recent months has seen spiralling automotive sales. This has happened for two reasons.

First, interest rates have dropped, so those who are employed—and the vast majority, 88 per cent or so of the people of Ontario, are employed and a goodly number of them enjoy jobs that allow them to buy those fairly expensive, big-ticket items—are now getting into buying those items again because, while they cannot fully finance them, they can afford interest rates that have dropped down to more respectable levels. They are not as low as I would want them but they are at more respectable levels.

There is another side of the coin, which is that at the same time the interest rates on borrowing have dropped to more respectable levels, inter-

est rates on savings have dropped dramatically. It seems obvious to me that one of the reasons those who were employed were putting their money away was the very high interest rates they were earning on their money. As little as nine or 10 months ago banks were paying 14 or 15 per cent on simple savings; on short-term notes the interest rate was up to 17 or 18 per cent and people were leaving their money there because it was growing very quickly.

If you go to a bank today, on your savings account you will get somewhere between six and one half and seven per cent. People are seeing that now they have saved a substantial amount of money through the interest that was payable, they are prepared to move back out into the marketplace and buy those freezers, those sofas and those cars.

Quite frankly, I do not believe—and the car market proves me right—that the Treasurer's \$55-million tax holiday for those who already have the money was in any way, shape or form necessary. Indeed, it seems to me it could be argued very forcefully that had the Treasurer taken this \$55 million and put it into the construction industry, so we could have constructed large, new amounts of low- and middle-income rental stock in this province, that in itself, as people moved from one location to another, would have generated much of the business in furniture and appliances to which the Treasurer has given a tax holiday.

And it would have done more. It would have created desperately needed jobs in the construction industry. There is almost no industry in this province that has been harder hit by the recession than the construction industry. Unemployment rates in that industry in my community and in so many others have been absolutely astronomical: 60 to 70 per cent of the industry is out of work, and not for the last month, not for the last three months; some of those people, the vast majority of them, have been out of work for a year or more.

This was an opportunity for the Treasurer to put his money into solving, beginning to solve at least, the housing crisis in this province and at the same time to create many much-needed jobs, which would have had an accelerating effect on consumer spending and the so-called consumer-led recovery the Treasurer believes is so important.

While I and my party welcome the extension of the tax exemption for small businesses, I want to make the same points I made in last year's remarks. First, the exemption is limited to

incorporated small businesses. Second, and perhaps more important given the community I come from, it is limited to small businesses that are making a profit. This may come as a surprise to members from areas that have not been hard-hit by this recession—and there are areas of this province that have been far less hard-hit than mine—but very few small businesses in Windsor made any money last year or the year before, and very few will make any money this year.

I would have thought the Treasurer might have consulted with some of his cabinet colleagues, had some discussions with them or with some of his back-benchers, and they might have raised that very real problem with him. I cannot imagine there are very many small businesses in Sudbury that made any money last year or will make any money this year. I cannot imagine there are very many small businesses in Brantford that made any money last year—

Mr. Harris: For most of them, this is the best year they have had. Why don't you get your facts straight? Talk to the member for Sudbury, and find out how small businesses are doing.

Mr. Wrye: The ones that have survived?

Mr. Harris: Yes. Very well.

Mr. Wrye: The ones that are still in business—

Mr. Harris: Most are still in business and doing very well.

Mr. Wrye: —or the ones that went out of business because they did not get a break from this government? They did not get any break at all. My friend the member for Nipissing always reminds me of the ones that are still in business. That is exactly the problem. So many small businesses in my community could have used the help of this government last year. Yet the money was poured into giving a tax holiday to those already making a profit.

I understand that not all companies will survive, and that there is nothing implicitly wrong with making a profit. I understand that, and my party understands that. But I am saying the budget is wrong-headed. It helps those who in these very difficult times need help less. That is not to say it is not welcome for small businesses making a profit. It is to say the job of this government was and is and ought to be to help small businesses that are on the brink. This government has failed to do that.

I want to turn to a matter that troubles me greatly and that has bothered a number of people in my municipality. I have had a number of calls to my constituency office asking what

the Treasurer meant when he questioned the usefulness of continuing the Ontario property tax credit. That credit allows those of modest income to have some kind of relief. It is a program I would not describe as perfect, but it is one of the programs aimed at those who most need our help.

Yet here we are raising this possibility so we can argue throughout the next year, really waste our time arguing with the Treasurer, that this program should not be scrapped. Then he will announce next year: "We are not going to scrap the Ontario tax credit program. Aren't we great? Is that not a great thing for us to do?"

I think the only great thing the Treasurer could do right now is to stand up in his place tomorrow and say: "I reread that sentence and we are not going to do anything to the Ontario property tax credit. We are not going to scrap it. We are not going to hit those who can least afford it one more time."

5:30 p.m.

I am sorry my friend the member for Nipissing left, but I want to read into the record some of the host of letters we are getting. I just photocopied a handful which I raised and read into the record during question period. I want to raise them again in this budget speech.

It is curious the government seems to have so little idea of where it ought to be going in terms of providing some economic stimulation that would not be make-work, but would be responsible, would be useful in the short term and would put people back into gainful employment.

We have contacted a large number of municipalities regarding the scrapping of the Ontario home renewal program. The letters are virtually flying back to us from municipalities, all of which are exceedingly upset over the scrapping of this successful program.

I want to put a few of these letters on the record because they speak to a wide variety of reasons why each and every one of these municipalities think the program was a useful one. Some believe it was useful to help bring houses up to standard alone. Some have mentioned the fact it created jobs. Some have mentioned that by bringing what are often older homes that are substandard back up to the minimum standards of the municipality, there has not been a need to build new housing, thus saving the government money. There have been a number of very interesting responses.

The first letter comes from the clerk administrator of Penetanguishene who was asked to reply by the mayor. I will just read one sentence:

"This is an old town and we are concerned that the province may not reinstitute the OHRP program. It would be certainly detrimental in the long run."

The mayor of Goderich also responded. That town has received about \$250,000 since the inception of the program and has been able to fund most of the applications received. I do not know how it is going to fund the applications from now on. I suppose what will happen is there will be no more applications. Our friends on the other side of the aisle, led by the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, will just assume everything is all right.

The mayor says, "Fifty jobs funded by OHRP over the past three years"—that is 50 jobs in a small community. When the Minister of Industry and Trade (Mr. Walker) can brag about nine jobs, I think 50 over three years in a town the size of Goderich is probably worth mentioning. I should give this to him so he can use it as a statement by the ministry. It is obviously worth more jobs than some of the statements he has had. "Fifty jobs funded by OHRP over the past three years in excess of \$200,000 certainly contributed to the wellbeing of local contractors, whether they hired new staff or were able to maintain present staff levels in slow economic times."

The Treasurer did not promise us any rose garden last Tuesday. He said that while the recovery was under way it was going to be very slow. His figures certainly bear that out.

The city of St. Catharines is interesting. They had been able to make great use of the Ontario home renewal program. They had 66 applications in 1980. In 1981 the number went up to 86 and in 1982 they had 120. This government cut off funding for OHRP. It did not cut off any funding for advertising, but OHRP went in the first restraint cutback; they were able to fund only 41 of the 120 applications. It is too bad the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing does not ask the mayor of St. Catharines what has happened with the other 79.

The mayor of Welland has responded. He says: "It is clearly evident that OHRP has been very well accepted in the city of Welland. The program is very worth while and, without adequate funding, much of the existing housing which is below minimum standards will not be upgraded. It is imperative that funding be reinstituted for the home owner under the Ontario home renewal program."

The member for Nipissing ought to sit down

some time and have a chat with the people in the city of North Bay.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: He does. Every day.

Mr. Wrye: Then he would know, I am sure.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: He lives there and he knows that community. He doesn't have to play whispermill.

Mr. Wrye: Then I am sure my friend the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Elgie) will be aware, as the member for Nipissing will be aware, that this is the view of North Bay on the cancellation of OHRP. It is too bad he did not talk to the minister about it.

"This is to advise you that termination of funding under the OHRP program will have a substantial effect on this municipality's ability to deliver this program.

"A substantial amount of each loan to date has been forgivable, therefore repayment is being received on only one third of the total loan amount to date. Repayments are averaging in the range of \$2,500 to \$3,000 per month."

Well, with \$2,500 to \$3,000 per month they will not be able to fund very many programs.

The town of Fort Erie also sent us a reply. Here is the interesting thing about the Ontario home renewal program that the minister might have learned had he done any checking. This is a very interesting reply. It was not one which I thought of until we began to do some investigations. The co-ordinator for that community said:

"It is estimated that a total of 20 jobs have been created annually as a result of OHRP." Again, Fort Erie is just a small community. "Not that job creation was primarily for the OHRP"—this is the interesting part—"but the neighbours, upon seeing work being done, invited the contractor to look at their homes although the home owners were not part of the program.

"In one instance as many as four homes were being worked on simultaneously."

In other words, the program of bringing substandard housing up to standard in itself generated new jobs, a new commitment for people to bring their housing up to standard. After all, I thought jobs were the number one priority of this government in the budget, and yet a program which was funded to a meagre \$20 million is not to be funded this year, but this government will find money for advertising.

One last letter from the town of Dunnville:

"Personally, I feel this is one of the better and needed government programs and support it

emphatically. It is unfortunate that no new funds have been allocated to OHRP."

This gentleman goes on to say that fortunately for the town of Dunnville, they do have a decent reserve fund. I will be quite fair about it; many of the towns did indicate they have a fairly decent reserve fund, but many of them do not and as a result will be hard hit by the cancellation of this program.

I thought it was interesting that the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing once again this afternoon, as is his wont, turned over the solution of this problem, as he usually does, to the federal government. He said, "Well, the feds have a program so we will let them handle the problem."

This province has managed to let the feds manage so many problems, its deficit has reached the levels it has because this province continues to cop out of its responsibilities. This whole budget does.

I could speak at some length about the youth employment crisis. It seems to me the government would have found the numbers to be so startling and frightening that it would have done something and yet it has thrown virtually a pittance at the problems of youth unemployment. Most of its new money, \$25 million, is for a program of subsidizing employers for a short period of time without the commitment that those short-term jobs will turn into long-term jobs and that our young people will begin to be allowed to find the productivity of useful employment. I find that very disturbing.

I was struck by a figure my leader used last Friday in question period. He said that given the commitment this government had to youth unemployment in Ontario, if that commitment continues at the same level, some 19-year-olds will be 73 years of age before this government helps them to get a job. That is really discouraging and disturbing.

5:40 p.m.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: That is really the most idiotic analogy that has ever been propounded in this House.

Mr. Wrye: I would have thought the Minister of Education and Minister of Colleges and Universities (Miss Stephenson) would have more concern for young people than she shows.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: I have far more concern than you have, but I would not use stupid examples like that.

Mr. Wrye: I suspect, if the minister had more concern for young people, we would not have

this disgraceful amount of money being thrown at a program, a totally inadequate amount of money being given to a program when the need is so great and so desperate. We have 250,000 young people out of work, and this government finds \$36 million for them. It creates, with \$25 million of it, 12,500 jobs and the minister shrugs, she shakes her head and she feels that is adequate. That will lower youth unemployment by six per cent.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: I am shaking my head at your logic which is so full of holes it looks like a Swiss cheese.

Mr. Philip: They created 130 part-time jobs in Minaki. Don't you understand that?

Mr. Wrye: We are still waiting to find out how many of them are local.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Cousens): The member for Windsor-Sandwich is possibly being provocative. You are enjoying yourself.

Mr. Wrye: Some of the interjections—I will try to press on.

Finally, I want to speak about the 1983 capital acceleration program. This government trumpeted that it has a \$247-million acceleration of capital works to create 12,000 jobs. On reading a little further into the fine print the Treasurer did not bother putting in, it turns out that of \$246.8 million, the province is only putting in \$167.5 million. That is just fine, and typical of this government to play with numbers, taking credit where no credit is due. I suppose we all ought to be used to that.

Then we see this great new program is not a one-year program; it is a two-year program. These are not jobs that are going to be created now, today, next month or next year. This is not money the Minister of Education, the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry) or the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Snow) can go to the provincial Treasurer and ask for to get the ball rolling on this or that project. At some point the government will have to say "Whoa," because this is a two-year program. We are not going to create 12,000 jobs this year, and we should not pretend that. This program, even if it gets started instantly, will probably create—I will be generous—6,000 or 7,000 jobs this year. Will they be full-time jobs or part-time jobs? I suspect most of them will be the latter.

We also have that other great line, the one in my community we do not know whether to laugh or cry about, which is targeted primarily to regions of the province with higher levels of unemployment, and it is going to be co-ordinated

by the "bilge" program. We have hardly received one dollar from the "bilge" program so far, and I suspect somehow this government will manage to find that it will not pour any money or very little money into our community for this program as well.

I see my friend the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations in the House, and I remember this great provincial initiative. I remember my friend the member for Brantford saying that he and the minister got on a plane and went to Ottawa to see if they could not get Brantford included in the industry and labour adjustment program.

It is too bad we do not have an ILAP in this province. That is exactly what we ought to be doing. We ought to target this money specifically to those communities that have been hard hit over the long term. Everybody has been hard hit over the last seven or eight months, and those communities that were able to buffer themselves from the recession longest are the ones that are showing the most signs of coming out of it.

I have a look at the unemployment statistics every month, and the figures for Metropolitan Toronto and the city of Ottawa, to use two communities as an example, indicate the employment trend line in those two communities is far superior to that in many of the other cities that are surveyed.

As I said at the outset, I cannot agree with my friend the member for Humber (Mr. Kells), who said this budget deserves the support of all of us in the House.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: It is a great opportunity you are missing.

Mr. Wrye: I will have my opportunity in two or three years.

I regret that I cannot support the budget. There is so very little reason to support the budget, and I suppose that is the reason the honourable member's speech was so short: there is very little here to support. There is, indeed, very little in it; there is very little of substance, there is certainly nothing of creativity.

As I said at the outset, there is no vision; for so many people in Ontario, 500,000-plus unemployed, there is no light at the end of the tunnel. I hope that as this becomes clearer to the Treasurer in the months to come, perhaps he will take his own advice and bring in a mini-budget some time this fall, a budget that will address all of the problems this document should have addressed but completely failed to do.

Mr. Foulds: Mr. Speaker, I think that with the time available I will have 12 minutes to make some preliminary remarks about the Millertime budget.

I have been in the Legislature, some of my opponents would say, too long: 12 years.

Mr. Philip: No. No.

Mr. Foulds: Sometimes when I hear a budget like that just brought down by the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) I feel it myself. But frankly, the budget we had this year is, in the 12 years I have been in the House and the 12 years of the administration of this Premier (Mr. Davis), simply the most duplicitous, the most dishonest, the most inadequate budget that I and the people of Ontario have ever experienced.

The central question that must be asked after any budget revolves around questions like these: Is anybody better off as a result of the budget?

Mr. Philip: No.

Mr. Foulds: Is there a sense of direction of where the country or the province is going after the budget?

Mr. Philip: No.

The Acting Speaker: The member for Etobicoke (Mr. Philip) can go back to his seat if he wants to interject, and even then he might be brought to order.

Mr. Foulds: Is there even a hint or a touch of vision in the budget? Is there any hope for the helpless, the unemployed and those who, through no fault of their own, have become the victims in our society?

Some hon. members: No.

5:50 p.m.

Mr. Foulds: The answer to all of those questions has to be no. As my friend, my colleague and my very good parliamentarian, the member for Etobicoke, has said several times, the answer is simply no.

In a good budget, the answer "no" can also be given to those questions if there is something in it that leads to an answer "yes" in the coming years—a positive answer to any of those questions. If one goes through that series of questions as it applies to any future economic development, any future hope for those on social assistance or those who are unemployed, the answer would still have to be no. In that sense this budget is a total and absolute failure.

One thing in the budget those of us in opposition resent most is the implicit threats to those who cannot respond. I want to take one directly, from page 19: "Public agencies, munic-

ipalities, boards of education, universities, colleges and hospitals—indeed, all bodies financed largely through tax dollars—must be expected to show restraint in their compensation plans."

That is a veiled threat that the wage control legislation the government brought down last September is going to be continued. I would like this government to demonstrate one economic benefit that came as a result of that legislation. I would like them to demonstrate one job that has been created through it. I would like them to show me one extra fridge, one extra appliance, that has been bought as a result of it. I submit they are unable to do that.

More important, the threat that is naked in the budget this time is the threat to those on social assistance. "Recipients of provincial funds should not anticipate future increases at levels above, or even at, the rate of inflation." That means those people who are largely now living below the poverty line—because the rates of social assistance in Ontario are not very generous—will be living on less as inflation mounts. The Treasurer cannot make the commitment to the poor of this province that they will even keep pace with inflation. That is the worst kind of Neanderthal welfare-bashing, the worst kind of Reaganomics that we have seen in this province in a long time.

A sad thing about the so-called Progressive Conservative mindset is that it is progressive only when it is politically advantageous. It is progressive and spends money on the victims of our society only when the party can get political benefit from it. They do that when they want to further their own individual careers. This was the case with the present Premier; a lot of money was spent on education in the late 1960s when he held that portfolio. They do that when they feel the atmosphere out there is generous enough that the electorate will vote for them on those issues. That seems to me to be inherently dishonest.

I will mention a second thing about who benefits in this budget. Leading up to the federal budget on April 19 and leading up to this budget, we had a good deal of hype by both the federal and provincial treasurers. Both the federal and provincial treasurers are having, if I may say so, more and more parallel careers in every way. The hype we had was that the number one concern of government had to be unemployment.

If the number one concern is unemployment, then the number one obligation of government has to be to create jobs. It is that simple. You

engage in politics and obtain power so you can take some action. That is the point of politics. Politics is the art of the possible, but politics is also the endeavour of activity. If a person does not want to do anything, he should be a philosopher and think about problems and write knowingly, productively and stimulatingly about them, but he should not be a politician.

When a person undertakes a politician's role, he undertakes a very grave responsibility. His commitment has to be to action. It has to be a commitment to use whatever authority, influence and power he has to change things, to make things better. That is what politics is about; it is a commitment to action.

If the number one priority is unemployment, then the number one action of a politician in power—and the Treasurer is a politician in power; he is the politician who is the chief financial officer and the chief economist of the province—has to be to create jobs.

I am sorry to say that the Treasurer, by his own admission, failed and failed miserably on that test. He admits that the unemployment rate will increase during the year of this budget. I do not say it will increase as a result of the budget, because there is nothing in the budget that creates unemployment; I admit that. But there is nothing in the budget that creates employment either.

That is a very grave abdication of responsibility on the part of the Treasurer. A Treasurer's job involves more than dealing as an accountant with the balance books of the province. It is a Treasurer's job to deal with the economic fabric of our province. The Treasurer has failed to do that.

As well as that, there is the threat to the municipalities, the agencies and the boards. I quote from page 20: "I have questioned the usefulness of continuing the Ontario property tax credit now that comprehensive property tax

reform has been postponed indefinitely and local taxes account for a lower percentage of personal income than they did in the early 1970s."

If property tax reform has not been brought into effect, it is this government's responsibility, because with a huge majority it has not had the guts to implement this in more than a decade.

Mr. Martel: They started that in 1967.

Mr. Foulds: My colleague the member for Sudbury East (Mr. Martel), who has been in this place four years longer than I have, says they started saying they were going to do that in 1967. If they have the power, if they have the majority, they have to have the guts to bring in the kinds of programs they say they believe in. Even with a majority in the good years of spending, and now with a majority in the so-called bad years, the Tories did not have and do not have the guts to bring in that kind of reform.

In the minute or two I have remaining to wrap up this section of my remarks, I would suggest that the very fact there has not been property tax reform is the reason property tax credits are increasingly needed by those who in the old areas of town are overtaxed because there has not been tax reform. Because their incomes, by and large, are lower, they do not receive the income to pay those taxes; therefore they need the property tax credit.

The Acting Speaker: This might be an appropriate time for the honourable member to—

Mr. Foulds: I see six seconds left. This is a petty budget of threats, distortions and absolutely no vision. I will deal with those items further in the budget debate.

On motion by Mr. Foulds, the debate was adjourned.

The House adjourned at 6 p.m.

CONTENTS

Monday, May 16, 1983

Statements by the ministry

Miller, Hon. F. S., Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics:	
Budget security	760
Stephenson, Hon. B. M., Minister of Education and Minister of Colleges and Universities:	
Colleges and Universities Amendment Act	759
Timbrell, Hon. D. R., Minister of Agriculture and Food:	
Death of Donald G. Davis	759

Oral questions

Baetz, Hon. R. C., Minister of Tourism and Recreation:	
Minaki Lodge , Mr. Nixon, Mr. Philip, Mr. O'Neil.	761
Bennett, Hon. C. F., Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing:	
Ontario home renewal program funds , Mr. Wrye.	768
Grossman, Hon. L. S., Minister of Health:	
Inspection of nursing homes , Mr. McClellan, Ms. Copps.	763
McCaffrey, Hon. B., Minister of Citizenship and Culture:	
Public libraries in Ontario , Mr. G. I. Miller, Mr. Foulds.	770
Norton, Hon. K. C., Minister of the Environment:	
Acid rain , Mr. T. P. Reid.	771
Ramsay, Hon. R. H., Minister of Labour:	
Securicor Investigation and Security Ltd. , Mr. Mackenzie, Mr. Wrye.	767
Employee health and safety , Mr. Martel.	771
Stephenson, Hon. B. M., Minister of Education and Minister of Colleges and Universities:	
French-language services , Mr. Nixon, Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Boudria.	760
Curriculum guidelines , Mr. Bradley, Mr. Grande.	765
French-language services , Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Boudria.	769
Taylor, Hon. G. W., Solicitor General:	
Securicor Investigation and Security Ltd. , Mr. Mackenzie, Mr. Wrye.	764
Walker, Hon. G. W., Minister of Industry and Trade:	
Massey-Ferguson , Mr. Barlow.	767

First readings

Ministry of Colleges and Universities Amendment Act , Bill 42, Miss Stephenson, agreed to	771
Income Tax Amendment Act , Bill 43, Mr. Ashe, agreed to.	771

Budget debate

Mr. Mackenzie.	772
Mr. Kells.	782
Mr. Wrye.	785
Mr. Foulds.	793

Other business

Oshawa Generals , Mr. Breaugh, Mr. Ramsay.	759
Speaker's wedding anniversary , Mr. Davis.	767
Answers to questions in Orders and Notices , Mr. Wells.	772
Adjournment	794

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Ashe, Hon. G. L., Minister of Revenue (Durham West PC)	
Baetz, Hon. R. C., Minister of Tourism and Recreation (Ottawa West PC)	
Barlow, W. W. (Cambridge PC)	
Bennett, Hon. C. F., Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Ottawa South PC)	
Boudria, D. (Prescott-Russell L)	
Bradley, J. J. (St. Catharines L)	
Breaugh, M. J. (Oshawa NDP)	
Cassidy, M. (Ottawa Centre NDP)	
Cooke, D. S. (Windsor-Riverside NDP)	
Copps, S. M. (Hamilton Centre L)	
Cousens, D., Deputy Chairman and Acting Speaker (York Centre PC)	
Davis, Hon. W. G., Premier (Brampton PC)	
Di Santo, O. (Downsview NDP)	
Elgie, Hon. R. G., Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (York East PC)	
Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP)	
Grande, T. (Oakwood NDP)	
Grossman, Hon. L. S., Minister of Health (St. Andrew-St. Patrick PC)	
Harris, M. D. (Nipissing PC)	
Kells, M. C. (Humber PC)	
Kerrio, V. G. (Niagara Falls L)	
Mackenzie, R. W. (Hamilton East NDP)	
Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)	
McCaffrey, Hon. R. B., Minister of Citizenship and Culture (Armourdale PC)	
McClellan, R. A. (Bellwoods NDP)	
Miller, Hon. F. S., Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics (Muskoka PC)	
Miller, G. I. (Haldimand-Norfolk L)	
Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)	
Norton, Hon. K. C., Minister of the Environment (Kingston and the Islands PC)	
O'Neil, H. P. (Quinte L)	
Philip, E. T. (Etobicoke NDP)	
Ramsay, Hon. R. H., Minister of Labour (Sault Ste. Marie PC)	
Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L-Lab.)	
Rotenberg, D. (Wilson Heights PC)	
Stephenson, Hon. B. M., Minister of Education and Minister of Colleges and Universities (York Mills PC)	
Taylor, Hon. G. W., Solicitor General (Simcoe Centre PC)	
Timbrell, Hon. D. R., Minister of Agriculture and Food (Don Mills PC)	
Turner, Hon. J. M., Speaker (Peterborough PC)	
Walker, Hon. G. W., Minister of Industry and Trade (London South PC)	
Welch, Hon. R. S., Minister of Energy and Deputy Premier (Brock PC)	
Wells, Hon. T. L., Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Scarborough North PC)	
Wrye, W. M. (Windsor-Sandwich L)	



Hansard

Official Report of Debates

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Third Session, 32nd Parliament

Tuesday, May 17, 1983

Afternoon Sitting

Speaker: Honourable John M. Turner

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

Contents of the proceedings reported in this issue of Hansard appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of the speakers taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is \$15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, Information Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 965-2238.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Tuesday, May 17, 1983

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

SIMILARITY OF BILLS

Mr. Speaker: On Friday last, the member for Etobicoke (Mr. Philip) raised a point of order in which he alleged that the introduction of Bill 32, An Act to amend the Landlord and Tenant Act, was not in order because the bill proposes to deal with a matter that is substantially the same as Bill 11, which was introduced earlier in this session.

It is well established by standing order 39 that no question or motion may be proposed upon which the judgement of the House has been expressed during the current session. However, in this case it cannot be said that the House has come to a decision on either of the bills, and I must rule that the member's point of order is not in order and cannot properly be submitted at this time.

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY

INDIAN BAND AGREEMENT

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to report to the members of the Legislature on the progress of the negotiations between the Islington band and the government. Members will recall that the government agreed in 1978 to implement the recommendations in the interim report of the Royal Commission on the Northern Environment that Ontario provide special attention to the social and economic needs of the Islington and Grassy Narrows Indian bands.

The progress of these negotiations over the last five years has been the subject of a number of questions and discussions in the House. In December 1982, Ontario and the Islington band reached an agreement in principle on a wide range of economic development and social programs. These programs are designed to assist the band in its efforts to improve the social and economic conditions on the reserve.

Last January I visited Kenora with my colleague the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Bernier) and addressed a public meeting to explain to interested citizens of the area, the

significance of the terms of the agreement in principle. After a wide-ranging discussion, I asked a number of interested local people to form a committee to focus the local concerns and provide me with their advice.

In February I again visited Kenora and met with the citizens' committee, receiving some valuable suggestions, a number of which have been incorporated in the final agreement. On the same day I visited the Islington band reserve and met Chief Isaac Mandamin to deliver to him for his review and response, an interim draft agreement as it had been developed to that time. Because of his desire to complete the agreement with Ontario, Chief Mandamin signed the interim draft agreement and had it delivered to the Premier (Mr. Davis) with a request that the province execute the draft agreement.

While the Ontario government is just as anxious as Chief Mandamin to execute the agreement, the draft signed by the chief contained wording that might have been misinterpreted in the future and I felt a little more time would be wisely spent in improving the style of the document. This has now been done and I have signed what I believe to be a suitable final document and sent it to Chief Mandamin. The differences between the two documents are mainly those I have made to improve the clarity of the agreement and to avoid difficulties that might otherwise arise in its implementation.

It is my sincere hope that the chief will sign this document and that the band will subsequently ratify the agreement so that the benefits the agreement provides can be implemented in the near future.

[Later]

Mr. Foulds: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: I wonder whether it is not incumbent upon the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development to table both the documents he referred to in his statement and make a statement about whether he has talked to Chief Mandamin in the meantime.

INSPECTION OF NURSING HOMES

Mr. McClellan: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: In yesterday's question period, the Minis-

ter of Health (Mr. Grossman) indicated he would be providing me with a report on the four nursing homes I questioned him about. His exact words were, "The honourable member will have that information by six o'clock this evening"—that is, information arising from my questions of February 22. I still have not received that report. I think that should be on the record.

Mr. Speaker: I am sure the minister will take note.

I think really these are not points of order. They would be better dealt with during question period.

WOMEN'S ISSUES MINISTERIAL APPOINTMENT

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I rise today to inform the House of an appointment that will be of particular interest not only to women in this province but to all our citizens.

Twenty years ago the government established the women's bureau in the Ministry of Labour to assist with the growing and continuous participation of women in the labour force. This year marks the 10th anniversary of the Ontario Status of Women Council, appointed by this government to advise on any and all matters of concern to women.

It was also 10 years ago that my colleague the Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Mrs. Birch) became Ontario's first woman cabinet minister. She continues to serve the government—

Mr. Breithaupt: Has it really been that long? It is as though it were yesterday.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Did the member for Kitchener say that? He said "It is as though it were yesterday" with affection and respect.

Mr. Breithaupt: Yes. I did not realize so much time had gone by.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I understand. If only some of his colleagues would demonstrate the same affection and respect.

Mr. Peterson: You always interject when you are embarrassed, don't you?

2:10 p.m.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am never embarrassed to speak about the Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Mrs. Birch) at any time, at any place and on any occasion. It would serve the member's own political interest if he would treat her with the same respect.

Mr. R. F. Johnston: Is that why you are appointing her minister?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Davis: She continues to serve the government and the people of Ontario with great commitment and dedication and has brought to cabinet a special understanding and sensitivity on issues affecting women. She has been in the forefront of efforts to advance the cause of women in this province, based on her personal and ministerial experiences.

She has recommended to me and to her cabinet colleagues that it is now time that a new structure be put in place to further this cause and I have accepted her advice in this matter. She has also assured me of her continuing commitment and interest.

As members of this House are well aware, these past two decades have witnessed profound change as women have moved into every aspect of working life in this province. Women now represent some 42 per cent of our province's labour force—

An hon. member: Why not a woman prime minister?

Hon. Mr. Davis: A woman prime minister: I will tell the member this: She would be a far superior prime minister of this province than his leader, who happens to be in Washington today.

Mr. Foulds: Why are you relieving her of these responsibilities?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Davis: They are embarrassed because the member for York South (Mr. Rae) was in Dallas yesterday and is in Washington today. Does he not know the politics of Ontario are here?

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Ashe: Why do you feel guilty over there?

Mr. R. F. Johnston: Give her the job.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The members can ask these questions at the appropriate time. Statements by the ministry; the Premier.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Women now represent some 42 per cent of our province's labour force and some 56 per cent of all women work outside their homes. This is a trend that it is obvious will continue.

These changes and increased opportunities for women have been reflected in legislation, in policy and in expenditures by this government. I need not remind members of this House, for example, that the Family Law Reform Act and

the Human Rights Code in this province introduced landmark reforms in Canada. This government has been sensitive to the particular needs of women in many other areas as well.

My responsibilities as Premier, reinforced by my experience at home, have caused me to develop a personal interest and concern for the cause of equality of opportunity for women in our schools, in our offices and factories, and in our institutions.

As someone engaged in public life, I recognize the great contributions of women to our labour force, and the potential for even greater involvement as we work together to eliminate those factors that now deny full and equal participation. I am keenly aware that Ontario needs the creative powers and hard work of all its citizens.

In my view, achieving full equality for women is vital to the equity and fairness on which our society is based. I believe we, as a people, can all be proud of the progress we have made as we recommit ourselves to fostering this objective.

It is increasingly apparent, I believe, that many issues of particular interest and concern to women are widely based, affecting several ministries, often at more than one level of government. Therefore we will proceed immediately with the recommendation that a minister be named responsible for women's issues, to provide a needed focus and a co-ordinating role in the delivery and communication of programs and policies designed to assist and encourage women in all aspects of life.

One of the minister's first duties will be to represent Ontario at a national meeting of ministers responsible for women's issues in Ottawa later this month. The minister will, of course, be a voice in cabinet on all issues of interest and concern to women. In partnership with others, this minister will also have the challenging task of analysing all proposals for their effect on women and recommending how these can best be implemented.

In the speech from the throne, the government indicated its intention to appoint a senior minister to undertake this responsibility. I am pleased to inform the House, therefore, that my most senior colleague in cabinet, the member for Brock (Mr. Welch), has agreed to become the minister responsible for women's issues.

This assignment will be in addition to his current responsibilities as Deputy Premier and Minister of Energy. I need not remind this House of the long and committed service of the member for Brock. I am convinced the experi-

ence he has gained from the many portfolios he has headed will serve him well in his new responsibilities.

He has demonstrated a long-standing interest in those issues of particular concern to women. It was the member for Brock who, as Attorney General, began the process of family law reform in Ontario. It was he who, as Provincial Secretary for Social Development, introduced a green paper on equal opportunity for women in Ontario, which served to focus public attention and debate.

His great compassion, sensitivity and commitment to human rights are well known throughout Ontario and will continue to serve all the people of Ontario in his new capacity. As I said at the outset, I believe that by achieving the goals of greater equity and fairness to women, we can build a society that is more equitable and fair to all its citizens.

I know members of this House now join me in assuring the minister of our full and enthusiastic support, and our best wishes for much success in discharging this new and significant responsibility.

I want to quote a former chairman of the advisory committee who has said, "The Honourable Robert Welch has been a tower of strength to this council, first as our minister, then as Attorney General. His indefatigable and resolute going to the people in every nook and cranny of Ontario with a film on matrimonial property must be applauded. He promised to listen to the women of Ontario. He will; he is that kind of person. We commend him."

ORAL QUESTIONS

WOMEN'S ISSUES

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, let me say at the outset I am somewhat confused, because I was under the impression the policy secretaries were in fact the senior ministers of the crown in the government. However, under the circumstances, I would like to congratulate the new minister. It is a very significant and important step forward, and we fully expect he will show the same concern as his predecessor always had for these issues of urgent and pressing concern for this province.

We have had only a very vague statement about the responsibilities the minister will assume, and therefore I would like to ask him if it is now his intention to consolidate some of the various issues into one portfolio. Will he be responsible for the Ontario Status of Women Council, as well as day care, the affirmative action program,

the employment standards branch and a variety of other programs pertaining specifically to women in the work force as well as in the public service? What will his priorities be as the new minister in charge of women's issues in this province?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I think perhaps the Leader of the Opposition will appreciate that, having received this assignment, it will be wise for me to consult with leaders who have taken responsible positions on these issues both in and out of government. Therefore the first round of consultative meetings will start tomorrow.

The Leader of the Opposition has been quite correct in pointing out the various activities within various ministries. This explains, really, why the Premier (Mr. Davis) was very anxious to have a focus and a co-ordinating organization of some kind to bring together all the activities that have been going on in several ministries of this government over the years.

The ultimate structure that will be designed would perhaps best await these consultations and the results of an examination of the various functions that is at present being carried out. I attach a great deal of importance to starting out by consulting with those who have been involved in this work. Number one on my list will be my distinguished predecessor in this responsibility, the Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Mrs. Birch), who has given such great leadership and has brought her style to bear on this.

2:20 p.m.

I want to indicate that I want to be very co-operative with the government of Canada, which has a focus and a co-ordinating structure as well, together with a number of other organizations. Then I think I would perhaps be in a much better position to recommend to the Premier what should be put in place in order to translate the mandate in some very real and positive way.

In summary, the emphasis now is that we have a sharper focus on it. Indeed, the responsibility of the minister will be to put in place a structure that will co-ordinate all of the many activities at present going on in several ministries of the government.

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, I apologize. From press reports, I was under the impression that the minister had been briefed by Sally Barnes yesterday and therefore knew all the issues concerned. However, we will give him time to

inform himself of the various issues in his new role.

But when he is analysing his own responsibilities, instead of just putting a new structure on some old programs, would the minister specifically promise this House that he will address those problems—particularly, for example, in his own Ministry of Energy?

According to the latest Status of Women Crown Employees report for the year 1981-82, of 73 women employed by his ministry, 50 hold clerical positions or are in the office service category. Women in his ministry earn an average salary of some \$18,189, which is 48.5 per cent of that earned by men in his ministry, which averages out to some \$37,525.

With respect to the training and development money in his ministry, although women make up some 50 per cent of the work force in the Ministry of Energy, they receive only some 31.6 per cent of the training dollars, even lower than the 41 per cent spent a year previously.

Would the minister, as he is trying to establish his good faith in this movement and become the new principal spokesman for the government, address his mind to the problems in his other responsibility of Minister of Energy?

Hon. Mr. Welch: I am very pleased the Leader of the Opposition has raised this point, because it does help to illustrate what one of the high-priority issues will be as far as this work is concerned.

The member singles out the Ministry of Energy. That is fair; indeed, I have made it my business to go into these particular facts and figures. The Leader of the Opposition would be fair enough to appreciate that in a ministry such as Energy there is proportionally a very small middle-management group. There is a very large concentration of professional people in a ministry such as Energy, and when one understands that, it helps to underline in a very real way the tremendous importance that has to be placed on bringing into even sharper focus the need for more women to be pursuing careers in the other professions.

As we know, there are increasing numbers of women in medicine and law, but when one thinks of engineering and some of the other professions, I think all would agree that more progress has to be made in convincing women that they can see fulfilling career opportunities in these other professions. That is manifesting itself in my ministry, where there is such a high proportion of professional people.

So I would attach a very high priority to what

the member says in so far as occupational emphasis is concerned and women themselves being encouraged to pursue careers in those other professions.

The Leader of the Opposition made some reference to issues, and perhaps in my haste to speak only in answer to his main question with respect to organizational matters I overlooked the fact that he did raise some questions about issues. There is no question there is a great deal of work to be done, building on what has already been done in the area of pensions and pension reform. This was referred to both in the speech from the throne and by the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) in his budget. The member opposite has been assured that there will be further statements on this.

There is the whole area of part-time work, the whole area of further reforms in family law and in skills training, the impact on women of the whole area of high technology and the commitment in the budget of the Treasurer for some \$4 million to be made available for skills training there. One could go on.

I want to assure the member that the emphasis, I hope with his encouragement and support, will be positive and progressive in the interests of those who are looking for leadership here for this type of encouragement.

Ms. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, I welcome the Premier's announcement today about the appointment of a senior cabinet minister, the member for Brock (Mr. Welch), as a spokesperson on women's issues, although I am surprised it took him about a month to fulfil this promise made in the throne speech, and many years to recognize it is essential to have a minister responsible for women's issues in the same way as our party has had a person responsible solely for women's issues for several years.

I am disappointed the Premier's announcement did not include notification that he had relieved the member of any of his other responsibilities as Deputy Premier and Minister of Energy. I would like to ask the minister if he can tell us just how much time he expects to be able to devote to his new responsibility. Will he have a staff to assist him, and can we expect some new legislation in the women's issues field this session?

Mr. Speaker: There were three questions there and I would ask the minister to address his attention to the last one please.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, in response to the honourable member's question, I do want to

underline what I have already indicated to her in writing—that I am anxious to meet with her as soon as convenient to have the benefit of her views on a number of issues, I do respect the fact that she has devoted a great deal of time to this whole area of women's issues, and I am sure I will benefit greatly from having the opportunity to review them.

Certainly the Premier has assured me I will have the resources that will be necessary in these early stages to bring together people who will be helpful in discharging the responsibilities he has assigned to me. I can assure the honourable member that with the help of those who will be brought together in this organization, we will then be in a better position some weeks from now to make some more specific recommendations with respect to structure.

The emphasis is to get on with the job, to build on what has already been done, to consult with those, such as the member for Beaches-Woodbine, who have a very keen interest in these issues, and I hope to make some real progress.

Mr. Wrye: Mr. Speaker, while the minister is newly appointed today to this job, he has been a long-time member of cabinet and undoubtedly has had some input into some of the major directions the cabinet has taken. I want to remind him that back in April of last year the Advisory Council on Equal Opportunity for Women, followed later by the Ontario Status of Women Council, suggested to his colleague the Minister of Labour (Mr. Ramsay) that—

Mr. Speaker: I will ask the honourable member to place his question please. The standing orders do not provide for any statements of fact or opinions.

Mr. Wrye: I am just trying to remind him of the background.

Mr. Speaker: I am sure he is aware. Please place your question.

Mr. Wrye: The Minister of Labour was advised that voluntary affirmative action had failed and both organizations suggested that mandatory affirmative action be implemented. The Minister of Labour said that while he clearly recognized the necessity, he did not believe—

Mr. Speaker: Order. Will the honourable member please place his question without any further delay.

Mr. Wrye: Can the minister share with us his preliminary observations on whether the time has not now come to move towards mandatory affirmative action?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I think it would be premature on my part to really share any judgement on that particular issue until I have had an opportunity to get an update on this. In fairness, tribute should be paid to my colleague the Minister of Labour who has spent a great deal of time on many of these issues. A tremendous amount of progress has been realized through the voluntary approach.

I am sure the honourable member would be the first to know that a very meaningful way to accomplish goals and objectives is to work from an educative and persuasive point of view to convince people with respect to adopting this and working with it, but I must tell him that I come into this responsibility quite prepared to be persuaded on a number of issues.

The important emphasis in this, and I am sure the member for Hamilton Centre (Ms. Copps) will agree with me, is to give some real meaning and substance to the term "equal opportunity." That is what we are about, that is why we are here: because we agree on this whole concept of equal opportunity for women. Indeed, we want to make sure that we remove any impediment that would stand in the way of their accomplishing that.

2:30 p.m.

TOXIC WASTE DISPOSAL

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, the minister really is wonderful. That was a great speech and I want to congratulate him.

I have a question for the Minister of the Environment. He is aware, I am sure, of the press conference this morning held by Dr. Chant and the Ontario Waste Management Corp. I gather they are moving towards some resolution of the difficult problems they are wrestling with.

What was most disturbing coming out of that press conference is that Dr. Chant's time line now is about four years, and according to his figures, we are still dumping about 750,000 long tons of poisonous toxic waste in a variety of places in Ontario on an annual basis—in sewer systems, lakes, landfill sites and who knows where. That means in the next four years another three million long tons will be dumped in this province in these same places; presumably, in many instances, in very unsafe and dangerous places.

What strategy does the minister have to deal with these problems until the completion of that facility?

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member would be well served and would also serve the public of Ontario well if he took the time to sit down—and I would be quite prepared to assign the staff of my ministry to sit down with him if he likes—to review what Dr. Chant and the Ontario Waste Management Corp. are referring to when they mention those kinds of figures. In most instances—I think it is safe to say in all instances—it is not the poisonous, toxic material the member is describing that is being dumped everywhere in the province.

There are a variety of classifications of waste in this particularly sensitive area. It is true there are some classifications of liquid industrial waste that are highly toxic. By and large, the most toxic ones are not being dumped. Some are being treated; in fact, a very considerable proportion at present is being treated in the province in places such as the Tricil facility in Lambton county.

There are some less harmful liquid wastes—and the member must not assume that all liquids fall into the category that he has just described—that are still going into some six or seven landfill sites which have been examined and are approved for that purpose.

I was not present at the press conference, but I understand there are a number of industrial sludges that have been included by the waste management corporation in its calculations. Those industrial sludges are regarded by many people as not suitable for categorization as hazardous materials.

There have been ongoing discussions between the staff of the waste management corporation and the staff of my ministry since one of the earlier reports of the waste management corporation in which there was a very large figure for unaccounted-for waste. All those figures are currently under review because it appears the consultants used an erroneous method to collect the data; we know they erred very substantially in some communities. We have done actual industry-by-industry surveys that demonstrate the consultants' figures were quite erroneous.

Mr. Peterson: If there is no problem, why is the minister going ahead with the waste management facility?

Hon. Mr. Norton: I did not say there was no problem. For example, polychlorinated biphenyls are being stored in this province, as I think the member is aware, in places like Smithville. Ontario Hydro has a site or two where they are being stored. We must find appropriate ways to

destroy those, but in the interim they are being stored. Certain other materials are being stored at present, and we will be diverting other materials, as the time is appropriate, into the waste stream that will be handled by the waste management corporation.

I have never said there is not a problem. All I am saying is that the kind of exaggerated and distorted statement emanating from the member, for example, in the question he raised this afternoon, serves no one well and does not communicate accurate information to the public. The problem is being addressed and will be addressed in plenty of time.

Mr. Charlton: Mr. Speaker, regardless of the extent of the problem, there is a problem out there. There are some toxic wastes that are not now being stored that perhaps should be. Is the ministry developing interim plans for dealing with some of the problem areas in the time frame between now and getting the waste management corporation operation in place?

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, we are certainly looking at a variety of things; for example, effective methods of PCB destruction. We have almost completed the guidelines that will be subject to an environmental assessment, which I hope will lead to the utilization of available technology in the destruction of PCBs before the end of this year. In the interim we will continue to look at any available method to safely dispose of hazardous or potentially hazardous materials.

To suggest there is a rampant problem out there is not correct—

Mr. Swart: Time.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. The minister has answered the question.

Mr. Elston: Mr. Speaker, the minister will be told shortly, if he has not yet been told, that Dr. Chant has indicated there has been some consultation between himself and his ministry with respect to the numbers. Dr. Chant indicated today that no information was presented to him that would dissuade him from his original contention that half of the 1.5 million long tons of generated waste for which his corporation was responsible would not be treated.

I challenge the Minister of the Environment to reduce the 750,000 tons, which my leader spoke about, by half between now and 1986-87. Can the ministry reduce those wastes by half in that time?

Hon. Mr. Norton: That is a very interesting question, Mr. Speaker. How long do I have?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You have 39 minutes and 27 seconds.

Hon. Mr. Norton: It is a very complicated question. I am not sure whence that question emanated, where the magic figure of a 50 per cent reduction came from. Is the honourable member suggesting I eat it?

There is a problem in terms of volume of waste, no question about it. Major strides have been taken in terms of recycling some of that waste, particularly oily wastes. That has now given rise to two new industries in Ontario that are thriving on the recycling of oily wastes.

We will continue to work with industries to try to generate that kind of utilization of organic waste material. Whether we can achieve a 50 per cent reduction in that time frame, I do not know, unless the member is suggesting we start shutting down industry in the province.

2:40 p.m.

WOMEN APPRENTICES

Ms. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the newly named spokesperson on women's issues. The reason I had hoped the minister chosen for this post would have been relieved of his other portfolio responsibilities is that women in Ontario occupy a second-class position in many fields.

Specifically, I want to ask the minister what is happening in the apprenticeship training field. Recent statistics from the Ontario government indicate that there are 856 fewer women apprentices now in Ontario than in 1981 and that whereas there has been an increase of nine per cent in total apprentices, there has been a 44 per cent decrease in women apprentices. We seem to be moving backwards in training women for skilled jobs.

What steps will the minister consider to ensure full access to mandatory skills training programs?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, as the honourable member will recall in response to the main question of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Peterson), there was some emphasis placed on this whole question of skills training. Indeed, as the member will recall, the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) has made an allocation of some \$4 million in this year's budget, with a special emphasis on this idea of skills training. That will be administered, as the member knows, by the Minister of Colleges and Universities (Miss Stephenson).

I have no reason to want to dispute the figures

mentioned by the member. What we have before us is a golden opportunity to impress upon guidance counsellors and people involved in the education system to ensure there is a broadening of the horizons with respect to the career opportunities that women see for themselves. I think that is a very important point.

I hope the resources which the Minister of Colleges and Universities has and this whole concern that is being expressed with respect to the impact of the advances in high technology, particularly on women, will provide us with an opportunity to attach an even higher priority to getting busy in the area to which the member makes reference.

As we reflect upon where we are, I point out to her that I think it was my colleague the member for Lincoln (Mr. Andrewes), when he was making his very excellent contribution in the throne speech debate on May 3, who used that opportunity to draw attention to this whole area of women's issues and brought us up to date on some of the progress that was being made. I commend him for that speech and for having included this particular area as part of his interest.

But I go back to what the member has urged on us and would attach some very high priority to that particular concern.

Ms. Bryden: I fail to see how it is a very high priority to provide skills training for women when the Treasurer said in his budget that he was going to introduce a number of new skills training initiatives in certain fields, only one of which would be for women. He did not give any specifics as to what that field was or what any of the other fields were either. That kind of vague promise from the Treasurer does not leave us with much to go on as to any action in this field.

Can the new spokesperson tell us whether he believes he can overcome the wage gap between men and women without adopting the principle of equal pay for work of equal value and mandatory affirmative action?

Hon. Mr. Welch: With the greatest respect, although I would like to address the matter, the supplementary is not related to the main question; it is a brand-new question. We were asked about—

Mr. Laughren: That's not for you to judge.

Mr. R. F. Johnston: Do you want to be Speaker too, as well as women's minister, Minister of Energy and Deputy Premier?

Hon. Mr. Welch: In all fairness, and I would hope that fairness would prevail, the main

question was about the apprenticeship program; now we are talking about equal pay for work of equal value. I am simply asking whether that is supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Will the minister please not enter into debate? He may answer the question if he wishes.

Hon. Mr. Welch: If we are now talking about equal pay, I would think I would be correct in drawing to the member's attention the speech from the throne and the commitment of the government to want to continue whatever steps are going to be necessary to close the gap in salaries or wages earned by men and women. That commitment is set out there.

There has been some interesting work done by the advisory council and by a number of others to take us from where we are now, as far as the equal pay provisions are concerned, although I must be very honest to share with members that I have not gone into all the intricacies and ramifications of the new composite test, which is seen as a progressive step towards a fuller realization and appreciation of some of the problems.

Ms. Bryden: It was promised a year ago.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Certainly as of this appointment today, I tell my friend, one of the matters on my agenda is to translate the commitment made in the speech from the throne to close that gap.

Ms. Copps: Mr. Speaker, when the minister made his comment earlier about the poor record, trying to justify the lousy record of his ministry in hiring women, in which he said most people working in capacities in his ministry are working as professionals, it reminded me a little of some years ago when the banks were looking for women for their boards of directors. They started by telling the women of this country that the reason they could not get women on their boards of directors was that they did not have women qualified for that.

In coming at this portfolio, the minister has to come at it with an open mind that there are women who are professionals who could be working in his ministry to clear up his record.

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

Ms. Copps: If the minister is really serious in going by the voluntary method, expecting the people of this province will bring in equal pay for work of equal value, how can he justify the fact that in his own ministry his record is substantially lower than the provincial average? For every dollar paid to a man in his ministry,

48.5 cents is paid to a woman. This is substantially lower even than the provincial average, which is not adequate for women in this province. How can he justify that when his own record in his past ministries is not acceptable and is intolerable?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, in all fairness, I would think the honourable member would want to be accurate. As a follow-up to the question of the Leader of the Opposition when he made reference to my ministry, I was not using the question of professional recruitment as an excuse. I was pointing out that in the Ministry of Energy there is a predominance of engineers, and I invited the member to look at the record as to the number of women who are preparing themselves for that profession.

I welcome the comment, as I welcome this member's comment with respect to the need to be aggressive and on the job with respect to that, but by the same token we have to make sure young women are being encouraged to see career opportunities in those other professions, of which engineering is one. That is the point I was making.

Because of the large numbers of, say, engineers in the ministry, it is perhaps not fair to make those judgements about that ministry. We have very few in the so-called middle management group. I am not here to try to defend what the situation may be now. I am here, I hope with the member's support and encouragement, to make improvements and progress.

We have a choice. We can spend all our time here talking about yesterday or we can get on and build on what has happened and make an even brighter tomorrow as far as equality of opportunity is concerned.

Mr. Foulds: Mr. Speaker, can the minister give us a commitment today that he will take one concrete step before this House adjourns in June or July to improve the condition of women with respect to equal pay for work of equal value, affirmative action and skills training and to reverse the scandalously low number of women in executive positions in the public service of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member has the commitment of this government with respect to the appointment announced by the Premier today, the statements made in the speech from the throne and the progressive steps we have already taken in the budget. After all, with respect to the business of the Canada pension plan, the commitment in the budget on pension reform which will

be announced by the minister, the whole tone is progress. I am quite prepared to be judged some months from now on that, which will be the fair time.

2:50 p.m.

INSPECTION OF NURSING HOMES

Mr. McClellan: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Health with respect to violations of unenforced regulations of the Nursing Homes Act and regulations.

It being after six of the clock on Monday, and the report not having been delivered as promised, let me ask the minister, since we dealt with Country Place Nursing Home yesterday and the violations there—by the way, they are still delivering meals in a golf cart, I understand—can he confirm or deny that his inspectors found violations of the regulations at the Lakewood Nursing Home in Huntsville, specifically violations of subsection 56(12) of the regulations which require adult-sized beds for adult-sized residents—in other words, the beds were deficient in size—and of clause 56(c), having to do with the requirement that a resident who is in a restraint should have his position changed every hour by a registered nurse or a registered nursing assistant?

Can the minister confirm that those or other violations were found at Lakewood?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I can confirm that there are some violations at Lakewood. I also want to apologize to the honourable member. I mentioned yesterday that I thought the information he had requested and I had undertaken to provide for him on three nursing homes several months ago had already been put in his hands. Later, when I asked why he had not had it, I discovered the answer was that since in all those cases it had been determined that indeed there were violations, our legal staff, pursuant to our instructions to move immediately where there were any violations throughout the system, had commenced certain proceedings in each of those cases, and therefore the distribution of some of the details could perhaps harm the ultimate success of the prosecutions we had undertaken.

That covers Country Place, which has indeed been charged. With regard to Lakewood, Barton Place and Good Samaritan, final decisions have not yet been taken, but they will be taken in the next day or two.

Mr. McClellan: My concern is very simple. As in the case of the Ark Eden Nursing Home, one

is free to draw the inference that the violations in each of these nursing homes took place under the nose of Ministry of Health inspectors and that the violations were not brought into enforcement until the matters were raised in the Legislature.

I want to ask the minister whether that is the case. In Barton Place, Country Place, Lakewood or the Good Samaritan Nursing Home were there violations of the regulations that were known to the minister's inspectors before February 21 or 22?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: As the member knows, we began to increase our inspection opportunities as long as a year ago, when a special team was brought into the ministry on contract to begin to review all the nursing homes in the province. That process took a number of months last year; so the simple answer to his question is that the crackdown had begun almost a year before the question was raised in this House. It took us most of last year to complete one inspection program of the province in some detail.

Finally, with regard to some of the other matters, those were done earlier this year. In the case of Country Place, which the member asked about, there have been six inspections done in the past month and a half.

Mr. McClellan: The minister is aware that as of April 14 the Ark Eden Nursing Home was still in violation of the act with respect to subsection 56(12), residents were still occupying cribs that were deficient in size, and the Ark Eden Nursing Home is still in violation even after the inquest.

Will the minister tell us whether it is true that there were adult-sized residents at the Lakewood Nursing Home living in infant-sized cribs, which, as the minister knows, produces curvature of the spine and respiratory difficulties? Can he tell us whether there are adult-sized residents at the Sunnyside Nursing Home at Sunderland who are living in infant-sized cribs?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: As I have indicated, if the member wants us to provide any details that our legal staff feel we can provide with regard to the new home he has raised this afternoon, we will try to provide them.

As I look briefly and quickly through the circumstances with regard to Lakewood, it appears that what we might call the crib or undersized bed problem is not one of those identified; but I would want to have another look at this in some more detail before I confirmed that.

ASSISTIVE DEVICES PROGRAM

Mr. T. P. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I also have a question for the Minister of Health in regard to his prosthetic devices program. The minister is aware that it has been close to a year and a half since his predecessor and the Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Mrs. Birch) announced a \$13-million-a-year program to cover some 15,000 handicapped children in our province.

Is the minister aware that as of the end of March 1983, only 6,808 children, not even half the 15,000 in need of the program, had been covered at a cost of only \$2,553,000 instead of the expected \$13 million? Obviously the minister's program is being implemented very slowly, if at all.

Further, is the minister aware that the upkeep of a wheelchair over the three-year period which is allowed for in the program before replacement sometimes equals the cost of the device, that the life expectancy of a wheelchair is only between six months to a year and that batteries for mechanical chairs cost between \$75 and \$100 and have a life expectancy of two to five months?

Is he also aware that all maintenance costs and the cost of batteries have to be borne by the users?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, let us put the figures in some perspective. The phase-in period was well known when it began. That is, it was known it would take one year to phase in the entire program. No one in this House or anywhere else suggested that on July 1, 1982, there would be 10,000 or 15,000 young people covered on day one. The members of the advisory committee and the members of this House knew that.

A committee was set up so there could be an orderly and proper phase-in of the program as arrangements were made for each of the different devices. As of March 31—I think the figure the honourable member gave was somewhat low, but not that low—there were 6,445 covered; and without the introduction of some of the new programs that are coming on, just taking it on an annual level, that would indicate there would be 9,700 covered by the end of the first fiscal year. As well, with the visual aids program for which a subcommittee of the committee has been struck, if we introduce that as of September 1, 1983, that will add another 10,000 young people at one fell swoop.

All in all, wherever the member is getting his

information, I think most members of the committee would report to him that there is an orderly and proper phase-in of the program, as was anticipated. It is not behind, either in numbers of people covered or in the moneys being spent.

Mr. T. P. Reid: It is nice that the minister, as usual, is so complacent about this, but there are a lot of people who need these devices. In view of the fact that the minister has got almost \$10 million, regardless of what he is talking about as far as phasing in goes, it is obvious he is not going to find the 15,000 he was targeting. Once again I ask, will the minister consider expanding the program to cover those people who are over 18 years of age?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: When the program was introduced, my colleague indicated, and we have subsequently confirmed, that at the conclusion of one full year of operation there will be a total review of the program to see where, when and if the program should be expanded. I am also confident that at some stage, when we have got the necessary expertise and advice, there will be an expansion of this program.

I should also say the fact that as much moneys as anticipated may not be spent is due in part to the excellent work of the members of that advisory committee. It has turned out that some of the assistive devices have been obtained at more advantageous prices and under more advantageous arrangements than was the case in other provinces which leapt right into it without doing this kind of work in advance and ended up paying far more than was appropriate.

The extent to which the budget is not fully spent is something that is not a criticism, I take it, as long as the number of children who ought to be covered are being covered. We seem to be on target on that basis.

RIGHT TO REFUSE WORK

Mr. Wildman: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour regarding the risk to the foetus of cytomegalovirus, or CMV, in that it can cause in utero death or severe retardation.

Does the minister not agree that any risk is too great for the three female teachers employed at the developmental day care centre of the Algoma District Mental Retardation Service in Sault Ste. Marie, since two are pregnant and one is planning a family? If so, will the minister intervene personally to ensure that these teachers are given the same rights to transfer as the female social workers of child-bearing age at the centre, who are represented by the Canadian

Union of Public Employees, or at least are given the right of leave of absence at full pay?

3 p.m.

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, in response to that question, I would advise the honourable member that I have already intervened personally. A meeting was arranged with the director for the board of education in Sault Ste. Marie, and it is my understanding that the concerns of the parties involved personally with this problem—and I share those concerns—are being addressed. The matter, if not resolved, is well on its way to being resolved. I am surprised to hear that question. It was my understanding that everything was straightened away.

Mr. Wildman: For the information of the minister, I was informed by the superintendent of personnel that the board of education and the Ministry of Community and Social Services had failed to work out an agreement on physical separation. As a matter of fact, the board of education has referred the matter to the regional office of the Ministry of Education in Sudbury. The teachers are on a temporary leave of absence with pay until the matter is resolved, but at this point it is not resolved.

Does the minister not agree that this case is similar to that of the pregnant worker at the Midwestern Regional Centre? That worker had the right to refuse unsafe work to protect her unborn child, under section 23 of the Occupational Health and Safety Act. Since teachers are excluded from the Occupational Health and Safety Act, they cannot protect themselves or their foetuses in the same way.

If the minister does agree, will he move quickly to amend the act to include teachers and all other workers who are not now covered, as recommended by the task force headed by my colleague the member for Sudbury East (Mr. Martel)?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: The ministry, in consultation with the Ministry of Education, has been working towards exactly what the member is asking for; that is, coverage of teachers under the Occupational Health and Safety Act. We have that as an objective, and I am quite sure we are going to be able to reach that objective in the not-too-distant future.

Mr. Bradley: Mr. Speaker, is the minister prepared to allow me to ask a supplementary of the Minister of Education (Miss Stephenson). Is that all right with you, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: It is up to the minister to redirect if he so desires.

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, I would just as soon the honourable member directed the question to me.

Mr. Bradley: I will direct it later to the Minister of Education.

HOSPITAL BEDS

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Health. His ministry has known for more than 10 years about the hospital bed shortage in Ottawa-Carleton. His own ministry's figures have brought out the fact that there is a shortage, at least this year and in 1982, of around 175 hospital beds. These are the figures published by his own ministry and by the Ottawa-Carleton Regional District Health Council. Yet the senior minister for Ottawa-Carleton does not buy these figures and is quoted as saying he does not believe there is a hospital bed shortage.

Given this situation, why would the minister refuse the new Ottawa General Hospital an additional 80 beds, for which apparently there is some \$7 million available for construction? He would prefer, according to the reports, to see the money spent on what is called "community health care," when everybody in Ottawa-Carleton, including the district health council, says the highest priority should be to alleviate the hospital bed shortage.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member would read some of the comments made by his Health critic, he would learn that some of the community-based programs we have been talking about, which the New Democratic Party Health critic and I have been pushing for and trying to introduce, do alleviate the bed shortage. They enable people to stay in their homes, to be discharged from the hospital area and to make and be given better use of community resources.

The geriatric assessment program that is going into place at the Ottawa Civic Hospital, with the support of this government, will be one of the great milestones in this province in terms of making sure that a better assessment is made of those people currently in hospital who could be discharged and that they are sent to places, be it homes, community programs or other institutions, where they will have more appropriate treatment and thus alleviating some of the bed pressures that may be existing in Ottawa.

Most other areas of the province would like to get that sort of service. The Ottawa-Carleton Regional District Health Council in Ottawa has

been pushing very strongly for it. In fact, that was the subject of its recent meeting in my office.

I also wish to take this opportunity to correct the record, Mr. Speaker. Not only has my colleague the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Mr. Bennett) been speaking to me about this matter for many months—long before the member dropped in this afternoon, having read this in the *Ottawa Citizen*—but also all my colleagues from the Ottawa area have been talking to us about this problem.

As a result, in addition to the geriatric assessment program, which will alleviate pressure on those beds, the Elisabeth Bruyère Health Centre has just opened 98 chronic care beds. Also, we are adding a palliative unit of 30 more beds; the geriatric assessment unit is 18 beds; 29 cardiac beds are being planned at the Civic and could open in September.

Later, the Civic will reopen 70 acute beds that were temporarily closed for renovations. Ambulatory care improvements will take place at Hal Montfort and the Salvation Army Grace General Hospital. The Royal Ottawa Hospital has expanded some of its outpatient services, which again will alleviate some pressures, and St. Vincent Hospital will receive \$1.25 million.

Mr. Martel: Is this a statement?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is a complete answer to the shallow allegations being made that the answer to the pressures in Ottawa would be to move to a strict bed guideline.

Having listened to the debates in this House, I would have to say that, with the exception of the member for Ottawa East (Mr. Roy), everyone has agreed the way to go in this province is to community-based programs, outpatient programs and the kinds of things we are doing in Ottawa rather than putting in more beds.

Mr. Roy: I am glad to hear the minister say his Conservative colleagues have lobbied effectively to see that there are additional hospital beds in Ottawa, because in yesterday's *Ottawa Citizen* the editorial said, "The attitude of local Conservative MPPs towards the well-documented problem of hospital bed shortages in Ottawa-Carleton is puzzling, to say the least."

That was what the *Ottawa Citizen* said about the minister's Conservative colleague.

Why will the minister not accept the recommendations of the Ottawa-Carleton Regional District Health Council and of committees in Ottawa which say clearly we are short 175 beds? Will the minister answer my question instead of

just talking to the member for Ottawa South? Why will he not pay attention to my questions?

Mr. Speaker: Order. I heard the question very clearly. I am sure the minister did as well.

Mr. Roy: He was talking to the puzzling member for Ottawa South. May I complete my question, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: I think you did. I heard it very clearly.

Mr. Roy: Not quite. My question is, will the minister allow the Ottawa General to build an additional 80 hospital health care beds?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There are not very many areas of the province for which the minister can stand up and recite the number of new beds, which I think total 147, as I recited them a moment ago—

Mr. Roy: Is that why the minister was reading the answer?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If the member wants to talk about reaching the provincial average, let me tell him—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That was not the question, with all respect.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, since the minister is making it quite clear that he is not prepared to bring Ottawa-Carleton up to the provincial average in terms of hospital beds provided, and since I presume he intends that Ottawa-Carleton is to be treated on a basis of equality with the rest of the province, is he now saying it is government policy that there are to be further cutbacks in active hospital treatment beds across the rest of the province?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I knew I would get the opportunity, and I thank the honourable member. In terms of the member making his final assessment with regard to overbedding or underbedding, there are two things he ought to keep in mind. First, there is the new hospital that is being built on the Quebec border. The member knows very well that will alleviate perhaps all the pressures and entirely change the ratio.

Mr. Roy: That's not what the health council says.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I hear a noise out of this ear.

Mr. Roy: Well, you should hear a noise.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Quite obviously, they do not want an answer.

Interjections.

3:10 p.m.

DONATIONS TO POLITICAL PARTIES

Mr. Philip: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing. The minister is no doubt aware that municipal funds have been spent by Mr. Frank Biss, Peterborough director of development and a prominent Conservative, to attend \$150 per plate Tory dinners for the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) and the Minister of Health (Mr. Grossman). Does the municipal affairs minister not agree that making donations to the Conservative Party or to any other party is inappropriate use of municipal funds, and will he initiate a public inquiry under the Public Inquiries Act into this abuse as has been suggested by a number of residents of the city of Peterborough?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, I would suggest if there is some wrong use of municipal funds, that is entirely a municipal responsibility. I have not received any request.

Mr. Philip: I wonder if the minister realizes that under section 17 of the Election Finances Reform Act, corporations may make contributions to political parties. Does the minister feel that municipal corporations should have that privilege or does he feel an amendment is perhaps in order to exclude municipal corporations from giving funds to the Conservative Party?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Let us go back for a moment. The very party now asking a question wants to have autonomy at the municipal level to make decisions by council. I trust this expenditure must go through the municipality at some point or other. Whether it has or not I do not know, but I am clearly saying it is the municipal council's responsibility, if it is levying funds to operate its industrial commission, to review those expenditures. I do not know whether the municipal council has approved it. I am suggesting to the member if he wants autonomy at the municipal level, then if the council has approved those expenditures, so be it. I have not had a request from any party at this point to examine any funds that have been expended—

Mr. R. F. Johnston: You just got one.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Just one moment; I have not had any request from that community at this point to review any of the expenditures of that commission.

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the minister is aware of the situation. It obviously raises a number of implications, presumably many of which we will review as we look at amendments to the act. Has he, and if he has not, will he request the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry) or the law officers of the crown to see if there have been any violations of the Election Finances Reform Act. I am referring specifically to subsection 20(1) in this particular case. Will he request that review to see if there have been any violations of the law?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to request a review of the situation if there seems to be an outstanding situation. Let me add only one other comment. Most of the industrial commissions that exist in this province, that is at the municipal level, do not exist entirely on municipal funds. There are contributions by the private sector to some of them to maintain the viability of their communities. The board of commissioners or directors of those corporations, generally speaking, are composed of members of council and the private sector. I am prepared to look at the situation.

Mr. O'Neil: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege: While we are on this point, the minister has just made a statement. I would like to accuse him of using funds from his ministry for political purposes, in that when he sends out or gives out cheques, or there are moneys being given to certain ridings, that he only allows his—

Mr. Speaker: Order, the member for Quinte; new question.

The minister, a point of privilege.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege: Since it has now been indicated by the member for Quinte that I have taken some privileges he believes I am not entitled to, as a minister of this government, I want to suggest to you, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: I just ruled that it was not a point of privilege.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: But, Mr. Speaker, the accusation has gone into the record, unless the member wants to strike it out—

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps you would like to correct the record.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, I would correct the record by saying that I never want to embarrass an opposition member in delivering any kind of a program on behalf of this government, which the members opposite so seldom want to support at any time.

Mr. O'Neil: On that same point of privilege. When the minister goes into our riding—

Mr. Speaker: Order. It is not a point of privilege.

Mr. O'Neil: I believe it is a point of privilege.

Mr. Speaker: No, it is not, with all respect. Order. The honourable member will resume his seat, please.

Mr. O'Neil: Mr. Speaker, I would like to correct the record.

Mr. Speaker: Order. You cannot correct the record on behalf of somebody else. This is getting into a debate, so we will have a new question.

FRENCH-LANGUAGE SERVICES

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Deputy Premier in the absence of the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Wells). I wonder if the Deputy Premier would be aware that last week the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs tabled the annual report of the office of the government co-ordinator of French-language services in this Legislature.

On page 15, the report states, "The government policy and budget commitment to the expansion of French-language services is a high priority." On page 28 of the same report it quotes the Solicitor General (Mr. G. W. Taylor) as saying, "The ministry is pursuing this program to recruit provincial police officers with French-language capability."

If such is the commitment of the government, can the Deputy Premier tell us why, after the wife battering report stated there is "a severe lack of French-language services in the Ontario Provincial Police," the Solicitor General stated in a letter to me on January 28 that "No further advertising to attract bilingual candidates would be contemplated" and he was satisfied that less than 10 per cent of the applications came from bilingual officers?

Is the Deputy Premier satisfied with that or what does he intend to do about it?

Hon. Mr. Welch: I would be very happy to discuss this matter further with the Solicitor General. I think the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, who has returned to his seat, would be the first to point out to the honourable member that the overall report shows significant progress in positioning services to accommodate the French-speaking population of the province.

REPORT

SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE OMBUDSMAN

Mr. Runciman: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a special report from the select committee on the Ombudsman and move adoption of its recommendations.

This is not the sort of report from the Ombudsman's committee with which members are familiar. It is a special report on the ways in which the assembly may act to make its voice heard against political killings, imprisonment, terror and torture. This stems from a resolution brought forward by the member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick).

I would urge all members to take 10 minutes or so to read this brief report. In it we explain why the committee, along with the government of Canada, believes that although foreign policy is properly the jurisdiction of the Parliament of Canada, there is an important and useful role for the Ontario Legislature in speaking out against violations of human rights throughout the world. We also indicate a number of possible methods the assembly may choose for fulfilling this role. The committee looks forward to hearing a debate on this report.

On motion by Mr. Runciman, the debate was adjourned.

3:20 p.m.

INTRODUCTION OF BILL

INCORPORATION OF VAL RITA-HARTY ACT

Mr. Piché moved, seconded by Mr. Eves, first reading of Bill Pr25, An Act to continue the Corporation of the Township of Owens, Williamson and Idington under the name of the Corporation of the Township of Val Rita-Harty.

Motion agreed to.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MISSIONARY CHURCH, CANADA EAST ACT

Mrs. Scrivener moved second reading of Bill Pr4, An Act respecting the Missionary Church, Canada East.

Motion agreed to.

Third reading also agreed to on motion.

DAVE HOLLIDAY LIMITED ACT

Mr. McKessock moved second reading of Bill

Pr8, An Act to revive Dave Holliday Limited.

Motion agreed to.

Third reading also agreed to on motion.

THUNDER BAY UNITED CHURCH CAMPS INCORPORATED ACT

Mr. Hennessy moved second reading of Bill Pr10, An Act to revive Thunder Bay United Church Camps Incorporated.

Motion agreed to.

Third reading also agreed to on motion.

THOMAS-HAMILTON-WEBBER LIMITED ACT

Mr. Breithaupt moved, on behalf of Mr. Van Horne, second reading of Bill Pr11, An Act to revive Thomas-Hamilton-Webber Limited.

Motion agreed to.

Third reading also agreed to on motion.

CHURCH OF THE VIRGIN MARY AND ST. ATHANASIUS ACT

Mr. Kennedy moved, on behalf of Mr. Jones, second reading of Bill Pr16, An Act to revive Coptic Orthodox Patriarchate of Alexandria, the Church of the Virgin Mary and St. Athanasius.

Motion agreed to.

Third reading also agreed to on motion.

THIRD READING

The following bill was given third reading on motion:

Bill 7, An Act to incorporate the Toronto Futures Exchange.

LANDLORD AND TENANT AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. McMurtry moved second reading of Bill 32, An Act to amend the Landlord and Tenant Act.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, I want to speak on this bill.

Mr. Speaker: Sorry. The member for Waterloo North (Mr. Epp) was up first, and I did not see him.

Mr. Cassidy: He is just short, that's all.

Mr. Speaker: No, he is not. It is the rims on my glasses.

Mr. Epp: Mr. Speaker, I had thought the minister was going to make a statement on this. Is he prepared to make a statement on the bill, or is he just going to introduce it?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, I have no opening statement. I really have nothing to add to what I said when I introduced the legislation last week.

Mr. Epp: I am pleased to be able to speak to this bill and indicate from the outset that my party will be supporting the proposed legislation, although we will have some amendments to make at the appropriate time.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, we have supported the rent review legislation for some time. I might draw to the attention of the members that it was my colleague the former member for St. George who introduced a private member's bill back in the early 1970s that first got on record the principle of rent review. It was only after that the New Democratic Party adopted this particular policy. So that being—

Mr. Cassidy: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Epp: Oh, he woke up.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: If I might correct the record, my bill proposing rent review in Ontario was presented for first reading in this Legislature and debated before the member for St. George was even elected to the Legislature.

The Deputy Speaker: I do not know if that is a point of order or not, but it is on the record.

Mr. Epp: It may be a point of order, but it is not true. Anyway—

Mr. Stokes: Try to be factual.

Mr. Epp: I am. That's what I am trying to do.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Don't provoke them.

3:30 p.m.

Mr. Epp: Irrespective of what the honourable member from the third party says, we are very much in support of this bill and we want to indicate that the government has not gone far enough with respect to legislation governing rent review.

We know, for instance, that we had a restraint bill here about six months ago, and at that time it was fully debated. We introduced some amendments at that time. Members will recall that we took the position that we supported the five per cent restraint legislation.

The legislation covered financial costs but did not cover operational costs. We felt at that time and we still feel that when you are going to have restraint on a particular piece of legislation, that legislation should extend to the operations, because if people's wages are going to be limited to five per cent, there is no differentiation made in where their money goes, whether

into financing or into operations. Therefore, we feel very strongly that the government should take it upon themselves to extend that legislation.

Of course, the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry) understands this very well, because he has a number of tenants in his own constituency of Eglinton, and I hope he feels he should support this kind of legislation. So we feel the government should in the future embark upon a more extended course and bring in amended legislation.

The other matter we would like to draw to his attention is the fact of the registry. As members know, the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Elgie) has pigeon-holed this particular suggestion for some months now. In fact, the government has not done anything on it since it was suggested in the standing committee on general government back in 1978, when Bill 163 was being debated.

We feel a registry should be kept where rents would be itemized and tenants could see the different rents that other people pay, so that some people are not, so to speak, ripped off, as they are now because they do not have any idea of what the person paid before in that particular unit. It would be very easy for the government to implement this in the various apartment buildings across the province, in the several thousand apartment buildings that are located both in Toronto and outside Metropolitan Toronto.

So we urge the government to take this suggestion seriously and not to wait until two or three years hence. Eventually they will have to implement it. If they do not implement it within two years, they will not have to worry about it because we on this side of the House will implement it.

So they have an opportunity to go on record as implementing a very good suggestion; but if they care to leave it too long, then they will lose their opportunity. You know what I am referring to, Mr. Speaker, and you may be in a position where you will not even have a chance to vote on it. Who knows?

The third thing I would like to point out is on demolition control. A private bill was suggested to the Legislature more than a year ago to have some control over demolition so developers could not just take a building, demolish it and thereby eliminate X number of units from the rental market. As members know, we have a vacancy rate of less than one per cent in Toronto, and I know the Attorney General is very attentive to this matter.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Just off the record, who was the fellow you introduced me to in Ottawa at the constitutional conference—the president of some association?

Mr. Epp: Did I introduce you to the Prime Minister?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: No. Some fellow who was there. I just wanted to get his name.

Mr. Epp: Why don't you send me a note?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I wanted to send him a transcript of your comments on property rights.

Mr. Epp: Yes. You support that and I support it.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I just wonder, as long as you're being able to reconcile everything you're saying now.

Mr. Epp: Oh, I don't think that is inconsistent at all. You know it is not inconsistent, otherwise you would not be supporting these amendments and would not be supporting the principle of property rights. As you know, I had a resolution on the order paper—in fact, I still have it. I know you would not support anything inconsistent, and since you are supporting both those suggestions, then there was no problem.

Now, to deal with demolition control, before the Attorney General interrupted me—and I know he will be supporting this private bill in the future if he has not supported it in the past. It is to prevent many valuable units from being taken out of the market because some developers demolish buildings for whatever reason.

One of the suggestions is not to demolish just any building, and part of that principle was that they would not be able to demolish buildings if the number of units represented more than half of what is permitted under a zoning change in a particular municipality. Toronto has asked for that.

I know some of the colleagues of the Attorney General support that bill. I wish he would not embarrass his colleagues by being slow in introducing and supporting that legislation. They are putting pressure on him. It would make it easier for him and his family, himself and 69 members, if they were to support that bill. I look forward to his introducing that government legislation in the House again or supporting the private bill.

This bill will prevent some of the landlords from converting apartment buildings to condominium-style buildings. Unfortunately, in any kind of legislation, what has happened and will happen in this case, is that some people who have purchased some buildings, maybe for only a few people, and legitimately tried to convert

them because their own group or families wanted to participate in the ownership and move in, are going to be hurt.

What has happened is that some of the developers and landlords and so forth who have bought big buildings and converted them to condominium-style complexes have hurt many of the tenants. The tenants have been evicted on short notice and because of the low vacancy rate, they have not been able to find similar accommodation at a similar rate in the neighbourhood in which they chose to live. The Attorney General and his colleagues should take very seriously the proposals made by this party, the third party, as well as by many other groups that more incentives have to be built into the market so more apartment units will be built.

One of the reasons that the tenant problem is so acute, the problem of finding units, is that not enough units are being built in the province. There are all kinds of reasons we can give. I suppose one of the most important reasons in the last 10 years for not building apartment units is not rent review, as some people have suspected and suggested it is. It may be part of the problem. I will not say it is not part of the problem. But one of the major problems has been the high interest rates.

What the government could very well do is build in some kind of incentives—they have done some of it, but I do not think they have done enough—in order to build many of the apartment units people so badly require across the province. When one has a vacancy rate of less than one per cent, then one knows what kind of difficulties people have in trying to find a single apartment of two or three bedrooms.

In my own experience only a few years ago, trying to find an apartment in downtown Toronto was very difficult. I had to be on a waiting list for some months before I was able to find an apartment. The Speaker and other members may have had the same difficulty. This is often for a second residence and is not as acute for members of the Legislature as it is for the family who only seeks a single apartment in which to reside.

Another point I want to raise has to do with hotel conversions. There are a number of apartment owners who have chosen to convert their buildings into hotels. It has happened in the constituency we are in. It has happened in Parkdale where my colleague the member for Parkdale (Mr. Ruprecht) resides. It has happened in the Eglinton riding of the Attorney

General. It has happened in almost every riding in Toronto.

3:40 p.m.

Owners take an apartment building, evict the tenants, put in their own furniture and then bring in new tenants who pay on a weekly or monthly basis, whatever the case may be. It is another excuse for increasing rents and evicting tenants who often cannot afford to pay the exorbitant rates chosen by the landlord. It is a form of ripoff that the new hotel owners often use. They often do not provide the facilities one would find in Sutton Place or other hotels where they have dining facilities and other facilities consistent with a hotel. All they do is call it a hotel and have regular apartments. The government should close this loophole that is obvious to everyone, but it is very reluctant to do so. I hoped when this legislation was introduced, it would have been a natural place to introduce legislation to close that loophole.

There is also a proposal in this bill that apartment buildings with fewer than six units be exempt from this legislation. We will be introducing an amendment to decrease that to four units. We will also be asking the government to refer this bill to a standing committee so people who want to speak, either in support of the legislation or in opposition to it, will have an opportunity to do so.

I want to make it very clear we are not asking to have the bill sitting in a committee for some weeks or months and not coming back to the Legislature. We feel very strongly that this legislation should be passed by the end of the month. A number of tenancies will be affected by it and we do not want people to be evicted for reasons of condominium-style conversions. We do, however, ask the government to refer this to a standing committee for a day or two and then bring it back to the House so it can receive third reading and royal assent.

Those are my comments at this time. I want to speak further on the amendment we will be proposing, but I hope to do that in the standing committee rather than in committee of the whole.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, my colleague the member for Etobicoke (Mr. Philip) will speak on this bill a little later. I would like to begin our contribution to this debate by paying him tribute for Bill 11, An Act to amend the Landlord and Tenant Act, from which the minister's bill has been copied. In the end, the minister chose to respond with a bill whose wording absolutely

mimics Bill 11, which came from the member for Etobicoke.

That member's bill was originally put forward in response to the problems that have been created by the court ruling, which permitted this purported occupation by somebody, the occupation of a whole building, where a group of people got together on a co-ownership, tenant-in-common arrangement. It is no surprise that the initiative originally came from here. In fact, there are a number of other related areas where I am sorry the minister has not chosen to act.

We share with the opposition and the government a desire that this particular loophole be closed quickly. There is a time element in this, because the application of the bill will be to any hearing that takes place after the bill has been proclaimed. Therefore, there is a note of urgency in all this. At the same time, I am disappointed that the government did not recognize long before now the difficulties we are having in areas where there is a substantial amount of rental accommodation. That includes my riding of Ottawa Centre and the region of Ottawa-Carleton as well as Toronto, Hamilton, Windsor, London and some other parts of the province. I am disappointed that the government chooses to act so slowly and with such reluctance when these problems come up, or to respond on such an ad hoc basis when it has been so clear for so long that we need more than just ad hocery to ensure a fair and equitable network of protection in implementing our commitments to protection of tenants in this province.

The spokesman for the Liberal Party has suggested the bill be referred out to committee. Since it is their prerogative to do so, I presume the bill will go to committee. If that is the case, we should make arrangements now by agreement within the parties so that the relevant committee is forewarned at this time and so that the committee will be enabled to have hearings at the earliest possible opportunity. When the bill goes out, if that is what is to be, there should be a deadline for it to come back in at the earliest possible time so that it is actually passed.

The problem is that there are other things my party and I would like to see happen with this bill, which are not going to be able to take place given the limitations on time. I would like to speak to those, though, because it seems to me it is important that the Attorney General know the kinds of problems we are experiencing with respect to tenants and with respect to actions by

landlords, by lawyers, by developers and by speculators, which are having the effect of undermining the protections that were meant to be given by the Residential Tenancies Act and the Landlord and Tenant Act.

I was in my constituency yesterday and I went to see a constituent who had asked to see me. I sat down with this fellow in a small basement apartment and got chatting with him. This is one of hundreds of thousands of stories that could be told about Ontario today. This person had the misfortune to have been working with the Beach foundry when it shut down in November 1980. That was a part of the Admiral group. The mismanagement that led to the shutdown of Admiral in Mississauga was preceded by mismanagement that led to the shutdown of the company's factory in my riding in Ottawa Centre.

When this shutdown occurred, my constituent lost a good job that was paying \$8 or \$9 an hour, I am not sure which. Anyway, it was enough for him and his wife to be able to live comfortably and to be able to pay the rent. He was unemployed for most of a year after that. He finally got a job working as a cleaner, and just the other day he had an increase in his job that took him from \$4.50 an hour to \$5 an hour. His take-home pay is of the order of \$340 every two weeks. His rent right now is \$265, and his landlord has informed him that he is to be evicted with his wife at the end of June because the landlord wishes to acquire the basement apartment for the purpose, it is said, of renovation.

I suspect modest renovations will be done to the apartment and that subsequently it will be re-let at an extremely high rent. In the meantime this constituent, who is decent, hardworking, aged 47, may or may not be able to get a decent and secure job for the remaining 20 years of his working life, and he is now to be put on the street. He fears he may have to pay \$350 or \$400 a month in rent. How the devil is he going to be able to pay that when his take-home pay every two weeks is only \$340? I do not know, but that is the kind of situation we are facing in my riding right now, and it is not addressed by this bill.

I met with a large group of constituents in the Mayfair Apartments on Metcalfe Street in downtown Ottawa. Some of them, including the former owner of the house I live in in Ottawa, have been living there for 10, 15, even 20 years or longer. It has been a stable group of tenants, some of them quite elderly. Along comes a new owner of the building, who suddenly passes around a notice saying, "We are awfully sorry, but the management has decided we are going

to do some renovations, and you are going to have to get out."

When the tenants began to inquire into this, they found that before the notice was even given about these fake repairs to be made, the landlord had started to make a public offer for people to buy into the apartment on a tenant-in-common or co-ownership basis. The Ontario Securities Commission wanted to look at that. It has been a loophole that may have been closed for future applications.

3:50 p.m.

In the meantime the people who lived in that building have been kicked out. Other people, elderly tenants, were eventually told they could stay in return for agreeing to increases of up to double their existing rent, increases that are flagrantly illegal, but they simply fear too much to fight them. No action is being taken on legislation to prevent that kind of evasion taking place in the future.

The third thing, referred to briefly by my colleague from the Liberal Party, is the problem of conversion to apartment hotels. I have an apartment hotel in my riding. It is the Arosa Apartment Hotel, situated on MacLaren Street near Elgin in downtown Ottawa.

A year or a year and one half ago the apartments in that building were renting for \$340 to \$400 per month. The landlords then decided they would convert it to an apartment hotel. They successively converted the units as people moved out. They issued some eviction notices, if I recall correctly. Now those same apartments, with nothing done to them at all, are renting for as much as \$40 per night. They rent on a monthly basis from \$700 to as much as \$1,200 per month, depending on how one chooses to rent them.

That has been deemed to be okay as far as the government is concerned. Somebody puts a few sticks of furniture into an apartment, calls it an apartment hotel, starts to rent it by the week or by the day or on a short-term basis and suddenly he has shaken himself free of the Landlord and Tenant Act and of rent review.

In the case of the Montebello Apartments, also in downtown Ottawa and also, as it happens, on MacLaren Street, the landlord has been systematically seeking to evict the tenants because of a change of use. The change is that the landlord wants to convert the building from rental residential property to an apartment hotel.

The fact is, the zoning in that area does not permit having an apartment hotel in the area,

but that does not faze the landlord. There has been a series of court battles, and there are now about seven or eight tenants who are still hanging on and fighting, trying to establish in law that what the landlord is seeking to do is wrong and illegal.

In this case the building had something like 125 units. Most of the tenants were not in a position where they could afford the risks entailed in going through an eviction proceeding and trying to fight the eviction in court, in paying the legal fees and running the risk that if they lost, they would be put out on the street with perhaps a day's, a couple of days' or a week's notice to find alternative accommodation in an apartment market in Ottawa where the vacancy rate is currently between 0.2 per cent and 0.7 per cent, depending on which count is made.

That is the situation we face right now. The minister's amendments will not respond to the problems of the people in the Mayfair Apartments, the Arosa apartments and the Montebello Apartments. What they will do is respond to the needs of a narrowly defined class of situation, which was found in Metropolitan Toronto and which we have had the hint of happening in Ottawa as well. They do not respond to the overall problem.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad you are listening as attentively as you are. The overall problem is that, because of the failure of the government to have a commitment to prevent people from walking around rent review, all sorts of wide operators and fast-buck artists are seeking a way to evade the protections given to tenants in rent review and in the Landlord and Tenant Act. If you plug an individual loophole, they will come along and try to use another one.

That is what is happening now. I would contend very seriously that it is an extremely unfair situation as far as tenants are concerned. It does not represent what I thought the will of this Legislature was when we adopted rent review back in 1975. I believe it is also a situation that is inefficient in providing decent accommodation at a fair price, which should surely be our objective in Ontario.

When the minister goes back to his home and his riding, he must go up Avenue Road. If the member for Etobicoke (Mr. Philip) would stop talking with the minister for a minute, I would like to make a suggestion to the minister.

When he drives home up Avenue Road one

evening, I would ask him to turn right at St. Clair Avenue.

Mr. Breithaupt: When he is driven home.

Mr. Cassidy: When he is driven home, that is right. I forgot about those perks. When he is driven home, would he ask his driver to turn right on St. Clair and would he look at a number of town houses that are on the north side of St. Clair at the first intersection east of Avenue Road?

Those town houses were built after the developer evicted a group of people from an older apartment house that occupied that site for probably 50 or 60 years. In some cases they had been there for many years. The rents were low; the location was good; the accommodation was decent. It provided a service for people, many of whom were on quite modest incomes.

Now six or eight town houses have been built there. They cannot be very attractive, or they are overpriced, because half of them are still vacant; they have been neither sold nor rented. We go from having maybe 40 apartments, which provided accommodation to people who now have to be subsidized in rent geared to income or senior citizen housing, or people whose lives have been disrupted, to a number of town houses that are not even being used. That, I would contend, certainly is not an adequate answer to the kind of housing problems we have in Toronto today.

We have those situations in Ottawa, London, Hamilton and other parts of the province as well because the government is prepared to see housing for greed as a priority over housing for need.

When it comes to the specifics of this particular bill, we would like, as I said earlier, to have a chance to spend some time in order to improve it. We would also like to suggest a number of other improvements to it. I think those changes are going to have to wait until we get Stuart Thom's report or until some of the legislation comes forward.

I hope those other matters I have adverted to will be responded to by amendments coming from the minister himself. We will be moving an amendment with respect to the number of units, because we think that six is too many to be exempted from this particular bill. My colleague the member for Etobicoke will be moving and speaking to that particular amendment.

I would like to suggest that if the Liberal Party wants this matter to go into committee, it should very seriously reconsider the suggestion that the matter go outside the House because of the

delays in the passage of the bill that would be introduced as a consequence. Many people are going to be evicted from their homes on May 30 if this bill has not been proclaimed by that time. That is only 13 days away from today. Therefore, rather than send the bill out and run the risk of its not coming back, I would suggest the bill be kept here, that we have the discussion in committee of the whole House.

If anybody wishes to put forward a position, it can be put in the hands of a member from one of the three parties, who can perhaps introduce their concerns into the Legislature. It is also open to people who have more general concerns about the issues I have been raising to raise them before the Thom commission during the weeks it still is going to be heard. But I do have to ask—and the city of Toronto obviously is of this feeling as well—whether it is worth while to send the matter out to committee if people whose homes could be preserved will be evicted as a consequence of the matter going out to committee.

In conclusion, we will support the bill. We are sorry it is piecemeal and will only plug certain loopholes. We recognize that this particular loophole does need to be plugged, but on behalf of my constituents and on behalf of many other people across the province I certainly wish the government would be aware of the fact that there are these fast-buck artists who are looking for ways to evade the existing law and, in response to that, that the government would either come in with comprehensive legislation to plug all the loopholes we know of right now or look to the creation of certain powers to prevent people from taking end runs around what the law clearly intends in providing security of tenure and rental protection for every tenant in Ontario.

4 p.m.

Mr. Ruprecht: Mr. Speaker, this legislation meets the concerns of tenants with respect to the present right of multi-owners to evict tenants under clause 107(1)(b) of the Landlord and Tenant Act. The intent of this bill is quite laudable, but what it does not cover is one of the most important things that is happening at present in my own riding. I am happy to see that my favourite Minister of the Environment (Mr. Norton) is here, and also the member for High Park-Swansea (Mr. Shymko), in whose riding the effects and loopholes of this bill will be felt by the people there.

Let me briefly tell the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry) what kinds of havoc and problems

are related to the specific loopholes this bill does not cover. It is very important to ensure that the minister gets full counsel with respect to what will take place if this bill is passed, even though it is laudable and the intention is very good, without the amendments of the opposition parties. Let me tell him what will happen in certain districts, including his own.

I will first speak quickly to the minister about the purposes of the conversions that are at present taking place in some of the apartment buildings. As he knows, clause 4(a) of the Residential Tenancies Act exempts from its jurisdiction "transient living accommodation provided in a hotel, motel, inn, tourist home, hostel or other similar accommodation."

Under the Landlord and Tenant Act landlords are allowed to evict tenants when possession of a residential unit is required for "conversion to use for a purpose other than rental residential premises." The approach an increasing number of landlords has taken is that, by furnishing previously rented units and supplying those units with everything right down to linens and dishwear, the accommodation can be categorized as being "other than rental residential premises." Landlords are therefore calling these units hotel units and are raising the rents up to as much as three times the amount previously charged.

In Toronto, with which the honourable member is very familiar, the zoning bylaws state that hotels are not allowed in residential districts, but this does not mean hotel-like accommodations are outlawed. In fact, they are not outlawed under present zoning bylaws. The zoning bylaw in the city of Toronto includes in its definition of a hotel "a building or a part of a building used mainly for the purpose of catering to the needs of the travelling public by supply of food, and also by the furnishing of sleeping accommodation of not fewer than six bedrooms."

As we know, there is no common dining room in these former apartment buildings where it is claimed that conversions by landlords to hotel units have occurred. Therefore, despite whatever advertising a landlord may choose to do, the city zoning bylaw would not define those buildings as hotels and, as such, they are not illegal from a zoning point of view. That means the city of Toronto cannot outlaw conversions, nor under present legislation can it stop what takes place in these neighbourhoods from Scarborough to North York to Etobicoke and certainly in my own area of Parkdale.

Let me briefly provide the minister with a

specific example of a case or cases so he can get his teeth into these problems in order to change this legislation and to have an open ear and an open mind to the amendments that are going to come from our party and the third party.

Let us look briefly at the case of 540 Sherbourne Street, I think in the riding of St. George. That apartment building contains 93 apartment units. The landlord, Toronto Apartment Building Co. Ltd., has through attrition over the past two or three years converted approximately 80 per cent of these units into, as they say, furnished hotel units. Toronto Apartment Building Co. Ltd. issued notices of termination of tenancy to the remaining tenants, claiming that the units were needed for conversion into hotel suites.

Judge H. Ward Allen ruled recently that the tenants could not be evicted on these grounds. His decision is being appealed in the Supreme Court of Ontario by the landlords, but we have no guarantee that the forthcoming judgement will plug the loophole. That is why the amendments are necessary in this specific Bill 32.

The next case concerns me directly, and that is the case of guarantee that the forthcoming judgement will plug the loophole. That is why the amendments are necessary in this specific Bill 32.

The next case concerns me directly, and that is the case of 200 Jameson Avenue, 96 Jameson Avenue, 109 Jameson Avenue, 166 Jameson Avenue and a host of other buildings in Toronto. In the case of 200 Jameson Avenue there are 97 units in the building; 39 have now been changed to furnished units. The landlord has applied to the Residential Tenancy Commission for rent increases for the remaining 58 units, claiming that the 39 furnished ones were exempt from the legislation.

Unless the minister is willing to plug this loophole, there will be tremendous damage done to certain communities and their stability. That is my basic point. If conversions to these hotel-like units were to be permitted, the first significant step that would be taken by the landlord would be that tenants would have to move. We all know that this specific conversion process is used for one purpose only, namely the purpose of tripling the rent and getting around the protection that was supposed to prevent tenants from being overcharged. Some landlords are moving in this direction to get away from the Landlord and Tenant Act, which protects tenants.

The minister is well aware of the shortage of apartment units in Toronto in the first place.

Consequently, if the loopholes are not plugged, these tenants are not only going to be asked to move and consequently and indirectly change the very nature of the community, as I will outline in a minute, but they are then going to be asked to find accommodation someplace else.

In Toronto, with a vacancy rate of less than 0.3 per cent, can the minister tell me where these tenants, who have been unjustly moved because of the greed of some of these landlords, are going to find accommodation? That is the unfairness of this situation. They are going to be kicked out and they are going to be looking someplace else; and as members know, there is simply no place else to go. That in itself will create a great hardship for these tenants.

Second and just as important, what happens to a community where these buildings are placed? When these tenants move, their children move along with them; that is obvious. The repercussions of this will be felt in the schools, by the teachers and in the very stability of the neighbourhood. When these tenants are asked to move—and there are hundreds on Jameson Avenue—it will affect at least two schools in the area when these children are withdrawn. It will affect the teachers; it will affect the very quality of education in that area.

While these repercussions will be felt indirectly, in a direct sense the area will deteriorate, and the people who have claimed in the past to be stable neighbours and stable tenants, who have looked after their properties and looked after the very streets in those neighbourhoods, will no longer be there to take an interest in the stability and cleanliness of that area.

4:10 p.m.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I think all members will agree I have been extremely lenient in the discussion of this bill. Although the member's point is very well taken, I think he is straying a little on second reading of the proposed piece of legislation.

Mr. Ruprecht: I will sum up quickly. I am simply indicating to the minister that this specific bill does not cover a very important aspect of tenant rights. By accepting our amendments and amendments of the third party, by a stroke of the pen the minister can make a significant change to create a stable neighbourhood.

If the minister were to change this legislation, which, as I said earlier, is laudable, he would re-create and restabilize a neighbourhood—and neighbourhoods in all of Metro Toronto—that would in turn be very grateful to him. I would

urge the minister to listen to the advocacy of our party and our official critic, who has indicated that he would wish this bill to be referred to either committee of the whole House or a standing committee or a special committee. In that way either people who have a direct interest in this bill could be heard or there could be an open discussion in this chamber so that amendments could be heard and made and legislated.

Mr. Philip: Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to speak in favour of this bill. I have pointed out before that this bill is pretty much a replica of Bill 11, which I introduced some time ago; indeed, it is word for word a copy of Bill 11, including the explanatory note. I appreciate that the Attorney General thinks so highly of my work and the work of my colleagues in the New Democratic caucus that he would follow with such exactness a bill that we introduced and called for some time ago.

This is not a new problem, despite the copyright laws and despite the fact that he as a university man, I am sure, knows there are certain rules about putting "ibid." and "op. cit." at the bottom of work that is copied. I realize that under the rules of the printing of bills there is no provision for that, but he might at least have shown some appreciation for the work of such people as Mary Bentley.

Mary Bentley is a real estate agent who saw that the kinds of things that were happening to senior citizens in the Lakeshore area not only were immoral but were creating real problems for those people in that community. Because of this she and groups such as the Lakeshore Tenants' Association and the Federation of Metro Tenants' Associations made their views known in no uncertain terms both in the media and to members of this House. The Attorney General might have mentioned those people when he introduced this bill instead of three Tory back-benchers. The tenants called me up and said: "What are they named for? Who are they? What did they do in all of this?"

The Attorney General might have had the good grace at least to acknowledge that I had introduced the bill, had written to him and had asked questions in the House some time ago and that, indeed, it was in response to questions raised by the leader of our party and by me that he made the promise that legislation would be forthcoming within 10 days. He did not make his deadline, but he came fairly close to it; and one has to compliment him on at least being in time to prevent what on the 31st of this month, we are

told by lawyers acting on behalf of certain tenants in the Lakeshore area, will be court hearings for as many as 30 families. These 30 families, many of them seniors, will be faced with eviction unless this bill passes and passes quickly, as a result of the unfortunate decision in the Medeiros case.

I can understand the reasoning of the Liberal Party in asking to send this out to committee, but I am somewhat puzzled by it. I am somewhat puzzled by it because I am sure that as responsible people in this Legislature they would have done the same thing my colleagues and I and, indeed, it appears the Attorney General have done in consulting with some of the tenant groups. They would recognize the very serious problem we have that this bill must be passed and must be proclaimed by May 31 or a judge hearing the case of those 30 families may come down with a decision similar to the Medeiros case, and these people could find themselves out on the street.

It is fairly clear that if this bill goes to committee, there will be no time to advertise, to have the kind of public input that is desirable and that would have been commendable had this bill been introduced even a month ago.

So I ask the members of the Liberal Party to reconsider their position seriously. If there is some way in which this can go to committee outside the House, have some hearings and have the assurance it will come back and be proclaimed before May 31, then we in this party, who have on numerous occasions referred the Ministry of Housing and Municipal Affairs report or countless tenant bills out for public hearings, would be the first to agree. But I suggest to members that unless we have that assurance, it should simply go to committee of the whole House and we should deal with the bill and get it passed today, if possible.

Mr. Epp: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege: With respect to the bill going to committee, coming back and being passed by May 31 so the tenants can be protected by this legislation, I made that one of the conditions when I spoke. Had the honourable member listened, he would have understood me to say that.

Mr. Philip: Mr. Speaker, I find the Liberal Party position confusing. The second speaker said "a committee or committee of the whole." We are not quite sure what they want. All I am saying is that I hope what they want is the same as what we want, which is to get the bill passed and to ensure that it is passed and proclaimed before May 31.

This is not a new problem. This is a problem that dates back to 1976, when there was the first attempt to get around condominium conversion bylaws by those people who wanted to sell a percentage interest in a building with an allocation of an apartment. It was called a tenancy in common. At that time I rose in this House—the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Elgie) will recall this—and I pointed out that an immediate stop had to be put to this kind of practice.

After the member for Scarborough Centre (Mr. Drea), who had recognized the problem when he was serving as parliamentary assistant to the minister, became the minister, legislation was brought through in the form of section 60 of the Condominium Act. At that time the government assured us the problem was solved. Of course, we saw that it was not solved, that there were still buildings, such as the Tandridge Arcot project, such as 41 Garfella, that had just the impossible situation where one had consumers, ordinary poor people, who thought they were buying a condominium or something like it, who were minority-interest holders in a building. We still had the same kind of frustration of one poor person trying to get possession of an apartment that was being occupied by someone of similar economic means who, of course, felt he had the right as a tenant to hold on to that apartment. This bill will not solve that problem.

4:20 p.m.

Despite the fact that the Attorney General had assured the House, in answer to my questions in 1977 and 1978, that tenants were protected from eviction, the Medeiros case suddenly said they did not have that kind of protection. But in the interim, that period of time between 1976 and 1978, there were still a number of evictions going on—illegal evictions, evictions by harassment or, as happened in so many cases, people simply saying, "I am tired of somebody knocking on my door and saying, 'You have my apartment; please give it to me.'"

This bill will save those tenants who are willing to exercise their legal rights to stay in those apartments. But it does not solve the overall problem; people will still merchandise using this technique, certain individuals will still find a way around the condominium conversion bylaws and, later, around section 60 of the Landlord and Tenant Act, and the consumer, as well as the tenant, will still be the one being ripped off.

In one of the early conversions, which was 41

Garfella in Rexdale, the people in that building now have appealed to the borough of Etobicoke to allow them to convert that building to a condominium, notwithstanding the fact that they would not normally have that right because they would not meet the criteria of the condominium conversion bylaws. Their plea is very simple. They are minority interest holders in a building in which the principal landlord can do anything he wants. They cannot even get the information about what he is doing. They are placed in an impossible situation.

What is even more frightening—I predicted this would happen, and we are now seeing the light—is that nobody will give a mortgage on those things. Suppose somebody said to the president of a mortgage company or somebody working for a bank, "I want a mortgage," and he said, "Fine, what do you have?" He does not have an apartment. He does not have a clear title. He has a share in which some other guy has the majority of shares and can do whatever he wants with the building. Would one put out money on that kind of investment? One would be pretty crazy to. Even Greymac would not invest money in that kind of thing.

The people at 41 Garfella are faced with a very serious problem; they own a percentage interest in the building, the mortgages are coming due now on the building and the mortgage companies will not touch it. What the people are asking is for the borough of Etobicoke to approve something which it would not normally approve under its condominium conversion bylaws.

I feel sorry for the Attorney General and for the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Elgie). The Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations has tried to plug this; he has tried to protect the tenants by introducing some changes to the regulations under the Securities Act requiring disclosure. We have a case now in which the owners of 557 The East Mall are arguing that they are not in violation of the Securities Act because they did not file a prospectus.

We have two ministers, the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations and the Attorney General, who are trying to solve a problem for tenants, and I congratulate them on it. But they are both going through the back door to try to solve a problem that the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing could solve by an amendment to the Planning Act to give municipalities the right to pass judgement on any

alternative use of buildings and to say either, "Yes, it is in the public interest" or, "No, it is not in the public interest and you may not do this."

We need that kind of legislation, the same kind of legislation that Toronto asked for in Bill Pr13, when it said, "We want the right to say 'yes' or 'no' when somebody comes to us and says we want to demolish an adequate apartment building," and that other bodies have asked for, saying, "We want control over this kind of end-run around the condominium conversion bylaws."

I feel sorry for these two ministers. What they are trying to do is prop up the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, who has failed to act and who could solve the problem through the front door and stop this situation once and for all, not just with this kind of conversion but with the hotel conversion system that my colleague the member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy) has talked about and the mayor of Ottawa has pleaded with the Housing minister to solve.

What we are going to see is a continuation of conversions in this manner. What this bill does is very simple. It says to tenants, "If you want to go ahead and exercise your legal rights, you cannot be evicted." But it will not stop the sale of buildings like this. It will not stop the harassment of tenants by those who have purchased the shares.

I urge the Attorney General and the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations—knowing his concern for tenants, he is probably already doing this—to convince the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing to do his job, because they cannot do it for him. I am not responsible for whatever cabinet splits there are. The Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing has failed to exercise his job, and the Attorney General is in this situation. I feel sorry for him. I am glad the Attorney General has done something. That is more than the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing has done.

We will be supporting this bill. As my colleague has indicated, we feel the exemption of six units is too high in areas such as Lakeshore and York West ridings. In Humber riding, there are apartments along Dixon Road that are sixplexes, and I can see the same real estate companies that are merchandising the slightly larger buildings, ranging from 30 to 90 apartments, saying, "If Bill 32 has caught us, we will go out and find a bunch of people with smaller buildings, sixplexes and less, and we will merchandise them with this gimmick anyway."

At the same time, I can recognize that the minister wants to protect the rights of families that may want to buy a small complex to have their parents or grandparents living close to them and for tax or other reasons may want some kind of equity situation split up. Therefore, we will be moving an amendment that the word "six" be changed to "four." We think that protects families who want legitimately to buy buildings like this so that they can be close to older parents and so forth. At the same time it will protect tenants in many areas such as in Lakeshore riding where there are a lot of small apartment buildings.

I am pleased the minister has responded. We will be voting for the bill. We hope that it can be dealt with expeditiously in committee of the whole and that the tenants will be protected from eviction when their cases come up on May 30.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, in relation to a brief history of this legislation, I appreciate the expressions of support from the members opposite, and the concern that is shared on both sides of the House in relation to tenants.

It is rather unfortunate that the member for Etobicoke continually uses the word "plagiarism." The fact is that very similar sections were contained, as he knows and as I pointed out the other day, in the Residential Tenancies Act in sections of the legislation that were not proclaimed. I could compliment the member for Etobicoke, when he wished to introduce a private member's bill, for going to that government legislation for those sections, but I think he might have wanted to give some credit to the people who drafted those sections in introducing his bill.

4:30 p.m.

Mr. Philip: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, to correct the record: The legislation the minister says was not proclaimed could have been proclaimed by the government. In fact—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Cousens): That is not a point of order.

Mr. Philip: Will you hear me out, Mr. Speaker?

The Acting Speaker: I am telling you it is not a point of order.

Mr. Philip: You listened to the minister; now listen to my point of order.

The Acting Speaker: No. I am saying it is not a point of order.

Mr. Philip: It is a point of order. How can you

tell it is not a point of order when you do not even listen?

The Acting Speaker: I have heard enough.

Mr. Philip: I am trying to correct the record, Mr. Speaker. The legislation did not come from the government; it was the work of the standing committee on general government. The wording is entirely different. If the minister had wanted to go that route, he would have copied that wording rather than my wording. I did not take it from the general government committee proposal. For the minister to suggest otherwise is simply nonsense.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, I invited members of the House to look at the legislation. Obviously with respect to that, we are talking about a residential tenancy commission about which there was a constitutional challenge. I congratulate the member for being wise enough to adopt that earlier wording with the change from "the judge" to "the commission." He should not get all hot and bothered about it, but I think he might have given the original drafters some credit, that is all.

When we talk about plagiarism, I remind the member for Etobicoke that both sides of this House are very well served in a most distinguished fashion by legislative counsel. Both sides of the House rely on legislative counsel to put into words the policy we agree upon. Legislative counsel advised members on both sides of the House about how to accomplish what we all wanted. To call that plagiarism, with all due respect, is indulging in some rather excessive and inaccurate rhetoric.

Be that as it may, I am pleased to have the support of members opposite. This is legislation to close a loophole. I agree with the comments of the member for Etobicoke that there is some degree of urgency. We did not expect the court to rule the way it did in the Medeiros case. We would like to have this legislation passed, and I know all three parties wish to see that happen as soon as possible.

A note that was passed to me a few moments ago indicated that the official opposition is now prepared to deal with this in committee of the whole. I thank them for that co-operation.

On the issue of six units as opposed to four, I think I can say now that we will not be accepting that amendment. But at the same time we recognize it is an issue about which reasonable people can disagree. Both four and six are relatively arbitrary figures. To accommodate the very type of situation the member for

Etobicoke referred to, mainly large families or people with other close associations, it was decided in our caucus that six was a more reasonable figure for people who desire to acquire not a large unit for family use or for individuals with other close associations.

I am simply not in a position to accept the amendment, because this was something that was debated at great length in our own caucus and I do not have the authorization to change the wishes of our caucus and cabinet in that respect. However, I do respect the intentions behind the proposed amendment and obviously concede, whether it is six units or four, that it is an issue about which very reasonable people can disagree.

I will conclude by thanking members opposite for their support in relation to legislation that is needed at this time. I think all members are well aware that the other issues which have been raised will be addressed by the Thom commission. Whether it is hotel conversion or any of the other issues, these warrant some additional study and I hope they will be addressed when the Thom commission reports.

Motion agreed to.

Bill ordered for committee of the whole House.

PROVINCIAL COURTS AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. McMurtry moved second reading of Bill 1, An Act to amend the Provincial Courts Act.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, I do not think I have anything to add to what I said after the introduction of this bill. I would only be repeating myself.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Speaker, as the Attorney General mentioned, his comments on first reading of the bill were quite clear in that there were concerns expressed by the Court of Appeal in a recent decision with respect to the serving beyond ordinary retirement age of certain judges and the necessity to obtain a reappointment from the Lieutenant Governor in Council.

As the members will recall, this change in legislation is before us as a result of a variety of comments and activities which occurred concerning the matter of judges' independence and which appeared at some length in the media towards the end of 1982 and in the early part of 1983.

The result of the case, which was particularly the matter of Her Majesty the Queen versus

Walter Valente, meant the impartiality of judges and their independence was called into question under the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, and the court viewed the circumstances with some concern.

Provincial judges' associations and others were concerned about whether a judge might be thought to be truly independent when he or she required certain salary arrangements, as well as other appointments and decisions, based upon the Attorney General of the day and whatever government policy might be.

Accordingly, to enhance the independence of the provincial judges, we now have Bill 1 before us. We certainly will support the bill. It is important to us to ensure every opportunity is taken to underline the independence of our judiciary. If there was some concern, because of the mechanics by which salary arrangements were reached or by the requirement for some approval to allow an annual continuation of employment after the normal retirement term, then those difficulties must be quickly laid to rest.

As I have said, the Attorney General set out quite clearly the purpose in this matter and we agree with it. The annual approval will now take place by the Judicial Council in these matters with respect to those who might choose to serve or be available to serve after the age of 70 and until the age of 75. I think it is most appropriate that there would not be appointments after the age of 75. Surely that is a sufficient term of service, and those burdened with the judicial cares and concerns could be allowed some retirement time as they approached what perhaps could at least be their latter years.

We support the bill and look forward to its implementation in legislation.

4:40 p.m.

Mr. Philip: Mr. Speaker, I was going to speak, but I will give the floor to my colleague the member for Riverdale.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, Bill 1 is before us to fulfil a commitment made by the Attorney General at the time of the case of Her Majesty the Queen and Walter Valente, concerning the independence of provincial court judges. It was decided by the Court of Appeal, with the Chief Justice of Ontario giving the judgement for the whole court.

In two places in that judgement, a specific reference is made to the commitment of the Attorney General to introduce this bill. On page 28 of the judgement of the court, the Chief

Justice further pointed out that the Attorney General was prepared to introduce at the next session of the Legislature an amendment to the Provincial Courts Act which would substitute the approval of the Chief Judge for his approval as the basis for reappointment between the ages of 65 and 70.

Again, at the very end of the judgement of the Chief Justice, he states, "I have also noted the willingness of the Attorney General to introduce an amendment to the Provincial Courts Act in this connection substituting the approval of the Chief Judge for his approval." So we have a bill with the very limited purpose of meeting the commitment made by the Attorney General with respect to the question of the provincial court judges' independence.

Our caucus will support the bill. We have no amendments to propose.

I do want to take a moment or two, now that this question of the independence of the judges has come before the assembly for the first time in a formal way, to refer to some of the criteria and comments that were made by the Chief Justice of Ontario, W. G. C. Howland, at the opening of the courts on January 7 last.

In the course of his remarks, he refers to the report of Chief Justice Deschênes on the independent judicial administration of the courts and to the study that was undertaken by a 17-member committee under the chairmanship of Mr. Justice Osler; that is, a committee of the judges of the court. The committee comprised the heads of the provincial, county and district courts, the Supreme Court and other representative members of the judiciary.

In an unanimous report, the committee approved of the first two stages in the Deschênes report, namely, consultation and decision-sharing between the judiciary and the executive, but did not favour at this time the third stage of independent judicial administration. It considered that for significant judicial independence, the following were essential. First, the judges should be consulted concerning provisions respecting tenure and should be assured that provision will be made by statute for a regular review of judicial salaries and annuities, at some stage of which the various categories of judges affected will be consulted.

The second comment is not appropriate for the bill that is before us but deals with the line between matters to be dealt with by the judges and matters to be dealt with by the Attorney General in the administration of justice. Amongst the matters that must be within control of the

judges is that of the activity of court personnel but not control of their salaries or the general terms of their employment, which is a matter we can refer to on another occasion when another bill comes before us.

I did want to ask the Attorney General, in the light of the comment made by the Chief Justice at the opening of the courts, what his intention will be now that the question of the independence of the provincial court judiciary has been established as a matter of law but nevertheless has left a number of matters that require legislative and executive attention.

Again I refer to the remarks made by the Chief Justice in the Valente case where he referred to matters that were not within his purview but were for the executive and for this assembly. I quote again from the judgement of the Chief Justice:

"It is appreciated that there are strong feelings on the part of some provincial judges that their independence should be secured in precisely the same way as the independence of superior court judges. This is a subject for the executive and the Legislature; it is not for me, in my judicial capacity, to enter into the merits of this controversy."

I end the quotation and ask, now that the specific limited matter contained in Bill 1 is before us fulfilling the commitment of the Attorney General, what comment he has to make about the intentions of the government with respect to completing and tidying up some of the matters that still remain of concern to complete, in the judges' mind, the other essential ingredients of their independence.

Personally, I am pleased the matter came before the court for clarification. I had no particular apprehension that the court was going to hold that they were not independent in the sense required by the Charter of Rights. That was not my major concern. Why it was not my major concern is quite obvious; I ran across nobody, in the course of my career in the practice of law, or amongst clients of my own or other people, who had any doubt whatsoever that the judges sitting in the provincial court were judges in the full sense of the term.

That was not a major concern of mine. But I did know that lurking in the background was this sense of apprehension, and at times frustration and concern, among the judges about some of these matters which may appear to be self-interest in some people's minds because they touch upon money matters, but matters of sufficient concern that dealt, not with the

public's perception of the independence of the judges but with their own perception of their own independence. In some people's minds, that may be linked entirely with the question of their own self-interest. It did not appear to me that this was the main or only motivation, even though it may naturally have had a part in the action which Judge Sharpe and, subsequently, other judges took on the matter.

It should also be made very clear that, so far as I can understand the case that came before the court, it was not some arbitrary decision of Judge Sharpe to decide to make a determination that he did not fall within the specific qualifications required by the charter but it was a matter raised by counsel before the court. There were matters which the court then had to decide in the ordinary adjudication. It was not some unilateral, arbitrary decision that he was not qualified or lacked that degree of independence and impartiality which a judge should expect to have.

4:50 p.m.

Those are all of the comments. The lengthy judgement of the Chief Justice deserves reading by those interested in this question, but I would specifically ask the Attorney General simply to comment on the remark made by the Chief Justice which I quoted, namely, what does the executive and what does this Legislature, as a result of the decision of the executive, intend to do now to complete the circle and establish in the minds of the judges and everyone else that this problem has been settled once and for all?

With those remarks, we will support the bill. There is no need, from our point of view, to put it into committee of the whole House.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, I thank the members opposite for their support. There is no question that the perception of independence is an important issue. I do not think anyone in this Legislature doubted for a moment that the provincial court judges are independent, but one always has to be as concerned with the perception of independence as we are with so many other matters in the area of justice.

As far as the Valente case is concerned, I have two preliminary observations. The substance of this legislation was an undertaking or a suggestion that I made to the Provincial Court Criminal Judges Association as to where I would be prepared to proceed in the issue of the perception of independence in this area. This undertaking, if it was in the form of an undertaking, was given before the Valente case was dealt

with by Judge Sharpe. In any event, the Valente case understandably attracted a good deal of attention both within and without the profession, and certainly in the public as a whole. I have to point out that there has not been any final determination of the Valente case as it is currently before the Supreme Court of Canada.

The issue of the perception of the independence of the judiciary has long been a concern of the Ministry of the Attorney General and of this particular Attorney General. I think it was as far back as 1976 that I tabled in this Legislature a white paper on courts administration which dealt in a very frank fashion with our concerns with respect to the perception of the independence of the judiciary. There are some who feel that our white paper did provide a certain degree of inspiration for the Deschenes report.

[Interruption]

Mr. Martel: You're burning the place down, Roy.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Is that a Liberal caucus going on?

Mr. Breithaupt: It might be. They wouldn't tell me about it.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Why is the fire alarm sounding?

The Deputy Speaker: Wait a minute; we will get clued in as to whether or not we should leave. Is it okay? I am told it is.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Our Courts of Justice Act, which we hope to introduce before the end of the spring, will deal with certain additional issues with respect to the independence of the judiciary or the appearance of independence of the judiciary.

They have not been finally determined; but, for example, I am confident one issue the Courts of Justice Act will deal with is in relation to the removal of a judge. That would be done by the Legislature as a whole and not by order in council. This is a matter of some interest.

We have not made a final decision on the issue of provincial judges' salaries. There are some who argue this should be a matter of determination for the Legislature as a whole. This is not something about which any consensus has been achieved so far as the judiciary is concerned.

There was, for example, a period in the federal Parliament when adjustments of salaries of Supreme Court and county court judges were delayed for a considerable period because of problems in scheduling legislation. Certainly,

many of our judges of so-called superior jurisdictions during those years made it known to this particular Attorney General that they would much prefer the provincial system of making these adjustments by order in council because they could be done on a more regular basis.

When it comes to judicial compensation, whether it is salaries or pensions, we have established in this province a mechanism with the potential for greater independence than that established by the Parliament of Canada. With respect to salaries and pensions, the Minister of Justice for Canada will have the advice of a committee, whose members are appointed by him, to give independent advice about the level of judiciary remuneration.

In Ontario, we have a provincial courts compensation committee, which is made up of a representative of the provincial court judges, a representative of the government and a neutral chairman, who is agreed upon by both parties. So in this respect we have created a mechanism that is more independent than that established by the Parliament of Canada.

There will be other administrative matters that will continue to be addressed in order to maintain a high level of perception of independence, as well as the reality that has fortunately existed in this province from virtually time immemorial.

The Deputy Speaker: Just to subdue everyone's curiosity, the fire alarm is due to pipe smoke in the government caucus office.

Motion agreed to.

Bill ordered for third reading.

SOLICITORS AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. McMurtry moved second reading of Bill 25, An Act to amend the Solicitors Act.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I have no opening statement other than what I stated earlier.

5 p.m.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Speaker, this bill is simply to make changes that would allow interest to be charged on unpaid accounts at the effective prime rate of the chartered banks, rather than at the traditional five per cent, which has been the case over past years.

It is clearly unfair, at least from my point of view, that someone who has an obligation should not be paying the equivalent rate that the borrowing of that money would occasion. Of course, even at the prime rate of interest which, according to section 36 of the Judicature Act, is the lowest rate of interest by a chartered bank to

the most credit worthy borrowers for prime business loans as determined and published by the Bank of Canada—at which perhaps none of us as individuals could borrow—the basis is, however, set for an appropriate interest charge on outstanding accounts.

There are certain protections in the amendment which require the taxation of solicitors' bills on occasion and the disallowance of interest or certain adjustments to be made if considered appropriate. Certainly the changes in the bill are satisfactory to us and we will support the legislation.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, it may surprise you but we will oppose the legislation. I do not have any great concern in particular about the change in the interest rate in connection with the bill but unless I am satisfied otherwise, it is not just a matter of the interest rate which is covered in the bill. The present Solicitors Act provides that, "A solicitor may charge interest at the rate of five per cent per annum on his disbursements and costs." That is what is in the Solicitors Act at present.

This bill will change that provision so, "a solicitor may charge interest on unpaid fees, charges or disbursements" at a rate not exceeding the prime rate. Others may be concerned about the prime rate and the question that is related to it but there is a very significant ambiguity at least, if not a very clear indication in the statute, that the words "disbursements and costs" did not include solicitors' fees.

We are being asked in this assembly to provide in the statute for interest on the fee portion of a solicitor's account. Some people may think I am raising some kind of a quibble, but I have read the definitions very clearly. I am not going to read them into the record, I leave it to the work of legislative counsel and counsel for the ministry. If one reads the definition of "costs" in the Canadian Law Dictionary; if one reads the definition of "costs" in Black's Law Dictionary, fifth edition, which is an American one; if one reads the definition of "costs" in Stroud's Judicial Dictionary, which of course is an English judicial dictionary; and if one reads the term "costs" in Sanagan's Encyclopaedia of Words and Phrases, Legal Maxims, which is a Canadian book; one will not find any solace that the word "costs" has anything to do with fees of a solicitor.

Costs is a matter awarded by the courts to a successful litigant as compensation and as an amount to be paid. It has no bearing on the question of what the money is then used for. He

may use it to pay his lawyers' fees, but the point I am making as best I can is that if one reads through the Solicitors Act, very clearly one will find the occasional reference to the word "costs."

In most instances, apart from one or two where it deals with a specific cost on a reference, the word "costs" is conjoined with a number of other words, "fees, costs, charges and disbursements." That is the litany of terms which are provided.

It would appear to me that under our Solicitors Act—and I certainly thought so at the time when I was practising and was bothering to submit accounts for work which was done—the fee portion, as distinct from the disbursement portion or the charges portion, was not subject to an interest charge because of the section of the Solicitors Act which we are being asked to amend.

There may well be some slight solace that one could derive from a statement in Jowitt's Dictionary of English Law, an English dictionary, which in 1977 said that costs include the solicitor's fee. One may find some slight solace in that, but one certainly will not find any solace with respect to the present statute which says that, "a solicitor may charge interest at the rate of five per cent per annum on his disbursements and costs." One will not find any solace that the word "costs" includes his fees.

I have not appeared before the taxing master on any accounts. Naturally, when I practised law, the work which I did was, of course, always totally acceptable to my clients and they would never dream of taxing a bill against me. I am certain there are other lawyers in the assembly who have had their bills taxed against them and it may well be that by some mistake interest has been charged.

I do not intend to labour this particular point, but I am going to draw the Attorney General's attention to the Solicitors Act and simply, for example, point out to him very clearly that in section 2 of the Solicitors Act, it states, "No action shall be brought for the recovery of fees, charges or disbursements for business done," etc. It then goes on to state very clearly in section 17 of the Solicitors Act that, "'services' includes fees, costs, charges and disbursements." If one reads the rest of that, one will find in every case where the term "costs" is mentioned in any of the sections of the Solicitors Act they are conjoined with fees, charges or disbursements. I suggest that fees are quite distinguishable from costs.

It is a point that only the member for Riverdale

would be interested in, but when we are introducing a bill into the assembly which purports only to change the interest rate which may be charged from five per cent to something not to exceed the prime rate, when in fact there is a very real question as to whether or not fees could be subject to an interest charge under the Solicitors Act, to then simply change the words "disbursements and costs" to read "unpaid fees, charges or disbursements," seems to me to be playing just a little bit too fast and loose with the exact meaning of the Solicitors Act.

I would hope that at some point members of the Attorney General's staff would look at the comments which I have made on this particular point. That is the reason. It may have been that if it had been simply the change of interest, that my colleagues would still have wished to oppose the bill. Lawyers are not amongst their closest friends, except for myself, of course, and the leader of the party. But apart from that question, this bill changes a matter of law which should not be changed without a direct reference in the bill to the change being made; and that is, on my interpretation which I had always followed, one could not charge interest on the fee portion of a solicitor's bill. It was that simple. It is that clear in my judgement.

We are now making a change that the fee portion of a solicitor's bill can have an interest charge added to it. In my view, that is a very significant and fundamental change. A good part of it may simply be a matter of practice. A good part of it may be that nobody has bothered to look at the ambiguity within the bill.

5:10 p.m.

If this matter had come up and I had the opportunity to look at it, I would have drafted the amendment to provide that the bill would change the provisions so a solicitor might charge interest on unpaid fees, costs, charges and disbursements, in order to use the same language that appears elsewhere in the Solicitors Act. I would have drawn clearly to the attention of the House that at least there was a very real question as to whether or not the fee portion of a solicitor's bill was subject to an interest charge under the present act. I leave that for my esoteric friends in the ministry to ponder.

For that reason, we will oppose this bill.

Mr. Roy: I had a long dissertation and speech prepared which would make the comments and research of the member for Riverdale look amateurish. I was prepared to give all that—

Mr. Martel: Well, give it to us then.

Mr. Roy: It does not take much to get them going, does it?

As I was listening to the member for Riverdale and closely reading this bill, it struck me that if I were to vote in favour of this bill or oppose it, I might well be accused of conflict of interest. Given that situation, I would be better to limit my comments and not say anything at all about Bill 25, although I would have welcomed the challenge to respond to my colleague the member for Riverdale.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: As the member for Riverdale states, if there is any question about the right of a solicitor under the existing section 35 of the Solicitors Act to charge interest on overdue accounts, the effect of this legislation is to clarify that and simply give solicitors the same rights as any other professionals in this regard. I think the legislation accomplishes that.

Motion agreed to.

Bill ordered for third reading.

SMALL CLAIMS COURTS AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. McMurtry moved second reading of Bill 28, An Act to amend the Small Claims Courts Act.

Mr. Breithaupt: There are two particular areas in this bill to which I would address my remarks. A certain number of other sections deal particularly with the repeal of matters that are obsolete and areas that have been changed by other legislation. I shall not refer to them.

The two areas in which I am particularly interested flow from a series of letters a number of members of the Legislature received, particularly from credit bureaus in their own constituencies. They dealt with post-judgement interest as well as the matter of the ability to give instructions to the local sheriff as agent for a judgement creditor.

In the first instance, the matter of post-judgement interest was of concern because the credit bureaus were denied the right to charge interest after judgement on small claims court actions for their clients. As we are all aware, interest is allowed in the county courts, and there was the general feeling that equivalence should be available, particularly as the jurisdiction value in dollars within the small claims courts now is much greater than it was in the county courts only a few years ago.

There was then the interest in having this matter resolved so that judgements would be paid forthwith by judgement debtors whose

debts otherwise would be subject to the accumulation of interest.

The second area dealt with a recent directive handed down by the office of the director of the courts administration to county sheriffs which barred an officer of a limited company from giving instructions to a sheriff in a proceeding. In effect, this would have required more lawyers to be involved in the administration of the proceedings which would allow the attachment of certain assets or the eventual collection of these obligations. That was thought to be an unnecessary additional expense when a credit bureau, as was often the case, had been given instructions by its client to proceed to the final realization of a debt and the obtaining of payment for it.

The directive to which I have referred, accordingly, required unnecessary expense and it is certainly appropriate that we see by the amendments to Bill 28 that situation has been resolved. Those expenses have to be passed on to the ultimate client. By the addition of costs in the administration of these collection procedures they are paid eventually either by the judgement debtor or by all consumers who have to pay the charges for collections as part of the overall business expenses which are added to the price of goods and services.

As a result, a variety of credit bureaus had written to members of the Legislature setting out these two themes. I am pleased to see they have been attended to in this legislation. We will certainly support the bill and agree with the other matters that have been sorted out in this, the first amendment to the Small Claims Courts Act that we have seen for some time.

5:20 p.m.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, this bill covers a number of points in a series of sections. I have no problem, nor do my colleagues, with sections 2, 3, 5, 7, and 8; but we have serious problems and reservations about sections 1, 4, and 6. Let me deal with section 6 first.

It is the view of our caucus on the theory of the small claims court that the expeditious settlement of disputes for monetary matters between litigants within areas which are small, even with the increases passed by the assembly for the jurisdictions of the court, are the kinds of matters which should be settled as expeditiously and efficaciously as possible, including the payment of the judgement.

Lawyers like to think every time a judgement is issued by a court they should have a right to attach the land belonging to the judgement

debtor in order to enforce payment. However, when we are talking about a small claims court and the jurisdiction of that court, even at the enhanced levels that we know, and the fundamental purpose of the court—for people to settle these claims—we think, not as a matter of logic following on from the superior courts but as a matter of the principle and the philosophy of those courts, there should not be a capacity to enter an execution against the lands of a small claims court judgement debtor. That is our view.

The reason for our feeling about it is that on balance we believe the great bulk of judgement debtors are ordinary people. It is very seldom the ordinary person goes to a small claims court to sue some corporation that owes him money or to sue his landlord for failure to return the interest on his rent deposit. Very seldom does that take place.

It seems to me the logic of applying Supreme Court and county court preconcepts to the small claims court and permitting a judgement creditor to file an execution against the title to the lands of a judgement debtor, which is my understanding of section 6, is something we are not prepared to accept.

Even if one could overcome that fundamental opposition to the concept in the small claims court, we certainly would not agree that collection agencies, which are the main people promoting this particular aspect, should be able, as agents for the judgement creditor, to file executions against the lands of the judgement debtor.

Those are matters of balanced judgement. They are not matters of logic, they just make sense. Anybody who knows the work we have tried to do in this assembly over the years to make the small claims court work does not in my judgement lead to any conclusion that a judgement debt should be filed against the title to the land.

There are some precatory—that is a strange word—but there is a loosely-phrased clause in this bill which then says if they do file it and do not remove it, the fellow can go against them and make certain they do remove it if the debt is paid. We do not particularly buy that quid pro quo that the judgement creditor somehow or other will remember to raise the execution against the lands upon receiving payment. Even my friend, the Deputy Speaker of the assembly, would agree with me on that particular point, had he a voice in this assembly to speak about it.

Those are my comments on section 6.

With respect to section 4, the provision of

interest on judgements at the Bank of Canada prime rate, given the concept, the philosophy and the reason about the small claims court, we do not think that in any way facilitates the expeditious settlement of claims we call major for the participants and minor in the bigger world of the Supreme Court or the county court. Not as a matter of logic because the logic says, "Why should you not have interest on your judgement?" But as a matter of the concept and the philosophy of the small claims court, we do not think it is at all appropriate to provide for that kind of interest at this late date in the Small Claims Courts Act.

It is not there now. I do not know why this assembly at this time should bow down to some false logic and now provide, as this bill would provide, for interest on judgements in the small claims court when in our view and in any view of the concept of those courts, it is not at all appropriate. So we oppose the bill as well because of the provisions of section 4.

The other provision which is of concern to me, I raise simply because it raises a somewhat broader question. If it were the only point, we could agree to disagree on the other two points. On this first clause—and I only raise it in order to stimulate a little bit of debate—we will want to move an amendment in committee on section 1 of the bill for the purposes of discussion. We intend, of course, to support the amendment which we will be putting forward, but we have no intention of dividing the assembly on the issue.

I was concerned, and we had an interesting discussion in our caucus about it, where it says in section 1 that the appointment of clerks, bailiffs and referees will now be by the Lieutenant Governor in Council rather than simply by the Lieutenant Governor. I am not going to argue about that. I do not find that a matter of particular concern.

The section then goes on to provide that the appointment of a referee shall be on the recommendation of the judge and the judge is in the best position to know the local conditions and to know of a suitable candidate. In my particular amendment I am not going to accept that. The interesting part of section 1 of the bill is not with respect to the question of appointments—but I will come back to that in a moment or two—it is the other clause in the bill which states, "and shall hold office during pleasure."

The section we are being asked to amend will be amended to read: "There shall be a clerk and

one or more bailiffs for every small claims court, who shall be appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council and hold office during pleasure."

I have a very real concern about the principal officers of the small claims court, extended beyond it to other courts, simply holding office during pleasure. There are some of my colleagues who would go so far as to indicate that the appointment of clerks for small claims court and the appointment of bailiffs for small claims court are a part of the patronage web of the Conservative Party in Ontario and that if we were to ever assume office it may well that we would want to have people with some different qualification.

I, of course, for a moment do not accept that patronage has anything to do with the kinds of appointments which have been made. I have had the highest respect for the clerks and bailiffs in the small claims court in exercising very onerous duties, but I do not think at this point in the administration of justice in Ontario that the principal officers of those courts should hold office during pleasure and that is what we are going to be asked to enshrine in the Small Claims Courts Act.

Therefore, for want of some better way to deal with it, I had a look at the Judicature Act and had a look at what seemed to me to be very good provisions related to the tenure and removal from office of Masters of the Supreme Court. It may seem a long way from clerk and bailiff of the small claims court to Master of the Supreme Court, just the very term Master of the Supreme Court as distinct from clerk of the small claims court, but in any event the Masters of the Supreme Court are protected by a reasonably sensible due process arrangement setting out the terms and conditions of their tenure. When we go into committee I want to move the amendment I have provided to my colleague the critic for the official opposition and to the Attorney General.

I am not saying that is the answer to it. I am saying that I think there is a serious question when the principal officers of those courts simply hold office during pleasure. I accept the principle that the appointments to the courts of their principal officers rather than the functioning of those officers is a role of the executive.

Some of my colleagues go so far as to indicate that they think the principal officers of those courts should be protected under the Civil Service Commission and not simply by the kind of appointment in question. This raises some

philosophical differences that I do not need to deal with at this particular point.

5:30 p.m.

There may well be worthwhile and very useful thinking that could be directed towards the terms and conditions of employment of the principal officers of the small claims court. It is with this in mind that, when we are in committee on the bill, I will move the amendment, a copy of which I have provided to the Attorney General and to the justice critic of the official opposition.

However, we have opposed the bill, as I have stated, for the reasons I have given, not only with respect to section 1, which I would be prepared to say was a matter of debate and discussion in committee of the whole, but principally because of the provisions of section 4 and section 6 of the bill.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, it would have been nice, since I am now taking responsibility for financial and commercial affairs, if in fact the opportunity had been taken to look more profoundly at the role and functioning of the small claims courts, with respect to whom they are meant to serve and what kind of access to what kind of justice is being provided.

The small claims courts have been around for a long time. They were originally intended, so it was argued, to provide a cheap means of settlement of debts and so on that would protect small people, be people's courts. What they have become is collection agents' courts.

Collection agencies, I believe, are the single largest users of the small claims courts. Some of that activity is presumably legitimate. They are working on behalf of small businesses that need to be paid if they are going to stay in business.

However, I believe the members are also familiar with the practices of some collection agents. Frankly, they are not entirely what I or anybody would like to see with respect to the harassment and the type of letters issued that stay just barely within the guidelines issued by the ministry. They are simply not tolerable in Ontario.

When, on the other hand, an individual seeks redress because he has been sold shoddy goods or has in some sense been badly treated within the commercial system, access to the small claims courts is extremely difficult. How to get to these courts and how to use them is a mystery. Even if the individual gets a judgement, the enforcement of the judgement is also a mystery unless a lawyer is used. If the individual uses a

lawyer and pays the usual fees, the lawyer's fees quickly extinguish any benefit that might be gained by any order that is made by the small claims courts.

I cannot vouch for this in terms of having a comprehensive knowledge. However, I have heard from time to time stories that have been brought to me about rather perverse judgements made in small claims courts that have worked against the interests of individuals. These people sought justice through the small claims route because their concern neither justified, nor could they afford, going to the county courts for that kind of settlement. It seems the small claims courts found it difficult at times to have—I hesitate to say this—the impartiality one would hope to see between the interests of people generally and the commercial interests that mainly use the small claims system.

One of my concerns would be the manner of appointment of bailiffs and other people who run the courts. These are order in council appointments. I have had some discussion about this with my friend and colleague the member for Riverdale, who has pointed out that all court appointments in Ontario are, technically speaking, order in council appointments.

To that extent all appointments to judicial positions in Ontario are open to the same problem. They tend to be made for reasons that include patronage. In fact, many of them were made for reasons that can only be described as patronage—that is, service of the government that happens to be in power in Ontario. It is a government that has been in power for a very long time.

We somehow expect that people who go to their reward by getting a judicial or small claims court appointment will automatically purge themselves of their political affiliations. Oddly enough, in the case of the higher courts, for example, more of that happens than perhaps we deserve to achieve.

Nonetheless, it narrows the group of people from whom these particular officials are chosen. It narrows the range of experience that is represented on the bench and in the small claims courts. It also tends to install one point of view with respect to the type of view that is taken by the officials of the court involved.

Where it is the higher courts there is a legal tradition that is pretty strong and may also lean too heavily on property and so on, but one cannot blame that only on the fact that in this province it is often Conservatives or people with

Conservative connections who get appointed to the bench. That is part of the traditions of British law that have descended to us here in Ontario. There is a conservative and a property-leaning tendency in the law.

When one gets into the small claims court, however, there is much less reliance on precedent; there is much less oversight because of appeals, because of higher courts stepping in or because of a kind of body of common practice in law that has been built up into the courts. Everybody tends to work a bit on his own.

The consequence of this is that the natural origins and prejudices of the appointees perhaps have greater sway in the small claims court than they do in other courts of the province. This in turn means that collection agents and other people who go in there to collect debts from small people and who are often supported either by lawyers or else by people who, although not lawyers have a great deal of experience in the application of the law as it is applied to small claims, have a tremendous advantage. They know the law; they know what to do and they also are appearing in front of people who are naturally very sympathetic to their point of view and less sympathetic to the problems of the people who for various reasons become objects of the claims that have been put in that small claims court.

The member for Riverdale has indicated our position on the bill as a whole. I simply wanted to share with the House those concerns and my concern that the Attorney General once again has perhaps avoided the opportunity of being a genuine innovator in finding ways by which this important part of the judicial system can work on behalf of all of the people who are its users and not just on behalf of the collection agencies and people of that ilk, who are the major beneficiaries and initiators of actions through the small claims courts of the province.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, I think the member for Ottawa Centre is perhaps a little unfair, to put it mildly, with respect to his general criticism of the small claims courts in this province. I think we have a very good system of small claims courts. We have a number of dedicated people at both the judicial and the official level who work very hard to serve all of the citizens in their particular communities.

I think he is also confusing the role of some of the officers of the court, some of the administrators, with respect to those who are serving in a judicial capacity. As the honourable member

knows, those who are serving in a judicial capacity are either those appointed as full-time small claims court judges on the recommendation of the provincial judicial council or those serving as part-time judges, as deputy judges, who can do so only on the initiative of the local county court judge.

With respect to the member for Riverdale's very thoughtful amendments with respect to the security of tenure in so far as some of these officials are concerned, I think it should be pointed out that officials, clerks and registrars throughout the court system, Supreme Court and county courts, have been appointed at pleasure, and there should be some consistency in relation to that system. It should also be pointed out that many of these people are part time, which I think is another reason for appointing at pleasure.

5:40 p.m.

I suggest, with respect, to the member for Riverdale, that we would be happy to discuss these amendments with him. We think they should be considered in relation to the new Courts of Justice Act, as they would represent a very significant and major departure from established practice.

With respect to the sections of the legislation allowing interest on the same basis as the county courts and Supreme Court and the filing of executions against land, our position is simply that the judgement creditors in these courts should have the same rights as the judgement creditors have in the county courts and Supreme Court. What we are dealing with here are courts that are very accessible to the ordinary citizens of the province, many of whom are small business people. The small business people of this province represent the backbone of the province in so many ways.

It is true that their interests are often represented by agents and collection agencies, because that is the only economical way in which they can assert their claims; but to suggest that the ordinary folk should not have, through a judgement in small claims court, the same rights of enforcement and collection of interest as those who obtain judgements in the county courts or Supreme Court is a difference in philosophical approach that we cannot agree with.

We think it is in the interest of all citizens in this province that people be encouraged to pay their debts, allowing reasonable post-judgement interest in the same manner as is allowed in the other courts. The filing of executions can only

encourage that attitude, which is so clearly in the interest of all citizens.

Motion agreed to.

Bill ordered for committee of the whole House.

ESTATES ADMINISTRATION AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. McMurtry moved second reading of Bill 29, An Act to amend the Estates Administration Act.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, I have no opening statement.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Speaker, on November 27, 1980, a bill was introduced in this House by the member for London South (Mr. Walker) in the absence and on behalf of the Attorney General. That was Bill 210, An Act to amend the Devolution of Estates Act. I will quote briefly from the statement the member for London South made that afternoon.

He said, "Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce today a bill to amend the Devolution of Estates Act. Within the past year, certain problems encountered in attempting to deal with the estates of persons dying in Ontario who leave beneficiaries in the Soviet Union have been brought to the attention of the minister.

"It appears that exorbitant charges by the Soviet government, or its agents, and the low exchange rate for conversion of dollars into rubles result in a beneficiary receiving less than the amount he should receive. While it is clear that Ontario legislation cannot completely rectify such problems, we should attempt to prevent such abuses to the extent this is possible."

The member for London South continued with other background information concerning equivalent law, particularly with respect to some procedures in New York state. That bill, which was introduced in the House some 29 months ago, was followed by a bill introduced by my former leader, Dr. Stuart Smith, to amend the succession law legislation following a somewhat more expanded view of the problems that we had at the time.

The third step in this chain of events was the introduction of a bill similar to Bill 210 on April 21, 1981. The Speaker will recall that that was the opening day of a new session. In the presence of a crowded gallery and with the floor crowded with various notables and worthies, seated on the chairs brought in for that purpose, we had the Attorney General rise in his place and introduce that bill.

It was, of course, well received. The Attorney General himself introduced the bill, and we had, on behalf of my former leader, Dr. Smith, his private member's bill on succession law, which again repeated the complementary approach and referred at that time to the prospect of some \$10 million to \$20 million being involved in these matters.

As I have said, that bill was introduced on April 21, 1981, just two years ago, but there was no particular progress as a result of that introduction. Therefore, on April 22, 1982, a year after that event, I introduced Bill 87. As a result, we had a further attempt to bring this theme before the Legislature and, I hope, to encourage the government of Ontario to become involved further in this subject. It has been well over two years since we first saw the province moved by some suggestion in this area.

The bill I introduced dealt with the apparent intervention by some communist governments in the disposal of estates by Canadian citizens to relatives living in certain eastern bloc countries. It had been brought to our attention that in many cases beneficiaries living behind the Iron Curtain were receiving far less than the full amount of their bequest from the deceased Canadian relative because the governments involved were apparently deducting large legal fees and, of course, currency exchange charges were being applied before the funds were transferred. Indeed, it was estimated, for instance, that a beneficiary living in the USSR or in other eastern European countries would be lucky perhaps to receive one tenth of the money left to him or her in a Canadian will.

Where an Ontario resident stipulated in a will that a bequest be transferred to the beneficiary living behind the Iron Curtain in the form of parcels and gifts, a heavy duty fee was also imposed on the recipient of that gift. Moreover, it appeared often that an application would suddenly be made to Ontario courts on behalf of the apparent beneficiary to vary the manner of payment. That is, the court was asked to change the manner of payment from the use of parcels and goods to hard currency. Of course, present Ontario law generally allows for such a variance in how payment is made from a will.

At that point—and this is just a year ago—we had serious concerns that the relatives living behind the Iron Curtain were often being coerced by their government authorities into authorizing those applications to our courts. Normally, the signature on the document was taken as sufficient proof to our courts of their wishes.

Once a change in manner of payment was made, the authorities, of course, were taking their appropriate cut.

Finally, there were instances where claims from persons behind the Iron Curtain were entered against the estates of Ontario citizens. Those claims alleged the existence of a bona fide relative who was entitled under our laws of succession to a portion of the estate; and there is a real concern as to whether some of those claims were legitimate. For instance, there was a case where, upon the death of an Ontario man, Soviet authorities alleged the existence of a long-lost wife. The Soviets obtained a power of attorney from the alleged widow and also produced a copy of marriage certificates. This all came as a great surprise to the close friends of the deceased. After four years of an intense legal wrangle and the fortuitous discovery by friends of the deceased of some further evidence, the Soviets eventually backed down from the claim.

As can well be imagined, the use of our courts by communist authorities for their own advantage in the guise of promoting the claims of certain beneficiaries living behind the Iron Curtain is, of course, cause for considerable grief and consternation among many Ontario citizens of eastern European origin.

5:50 p.m.

It was the intention of the bill I introduced a year ago to help prevent the potential for abuse in this regard. The bill was based on three principles. Upon an application being made to the court, the court must be satisfied, first, that the foreign beneficiary is entitled to property from the estate; second, that the foreign beneficiary should receive substantially the full benefit of the payment being made to that person; and third, that the result would be a just and equitable one, having regard to the intentions of the deceased person.

The bill I introduced further gave the court the authority to consider a broader range of circumstances and evidence that might not normally be admissible in a hearing of this nature. It would allow, for instance, the admission of evidence relating to the general practices of Iron Curtain countries in these cases.

In addition, the bill would allow for the introduction of evidence to ascertain what would have been the deceased person's intentions in the circumstances. For instance, this might include evidence of friends and relatives concerning the alleged foreign beneficiary, the

introduction of personal letters of the deceased and so forth.

Finally, the bill gave the court a broad range of options in carrying out its responsibilities. The court could order that the payment be made by way of parcels or goods or it could hold the payment in trust. Indeed, it might finally direct that the payment not be made and instead be divided among other legitimate beneficiaries.

In short, I believe our bill addressed the problem in three ways. It gave the courts jurisdiction to examine the broad context of an application of this nature; it gave our courts the wherewithal to examine all the relevant considerations; and finally, it gave our courts the flexibility to deal with the application in a just and equitable manner.

At this point I want to refer to a seminar held on February 3 at the University of Toronto under the sponsorship of the political science department of that university. Professor Gleb Zekulin was the introducer and the moderator of the seminar. The importance of this estates and wills area was once again stressed. Those attending the seminar were informed that perhaps 200,000 Canadians might be subject to Soviet law because they were born within areas controlled by the present-day Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Under Soviet citizenship law it is *jus sanguinis* and not *jus soli*: that is to say, it is the law of the blood by which citizenship and obligations are traced rather than by the law of the location where the person lives.

Dollar values of these estates also came under discussion, but as a result of the Soviet law any person leaving the territory of the Soviet Union after December 15, 1921, is apparently still considered a Soviet citizen for matters of beneficiary claims and other responsibilities. His descendants are also involved. As indicated at that seminar, perhaps 1.5 million Canadians could be technically involved, supposedly with claims, as some aspect of Soviet citizenship law might be applied there.

Comments were also made at that time about the amount of money, as I have said. Once again, the range of some \$10 million to \$20 million annually seems to be the expectation and the result of those problems. The dollar value is uncertain. A lawyer who acts on behalf of the Soviet authorities in these matters, and whose name I will not even bother to mention, apparently stated that there are some 30 to 40 cases a month and the average size of the estate is \$40,000. He later repudiated this in an interview with the *Ottawa Journal*, but in a letter to

another lawyer he said he had some 400 files open regarding Soviet estates. So some \$14 million to \$15 million may be involved annually for the Soviet Union alone and, indeed, another equally large amount may well go to other countries in the Soviet bloc. We do not have any details of the amounts of moneys involved, because statistics are not kept on those subjects.

The monitoring of that area by Statistics Canada—or, indeed, under some federal theme, since that would be a better national approach than only a provincial plan—or at least by having some companion legislation in other provinces, would be useful, but we are not able to deal with those matters at this point. There were questions from the audience during that seminar that commented not only on the government's legislation but also on my own, in that the matter of falsifying evidence was not being otherwise particularly looked into. We, of course, are moving towards many more electronic methods within our courts, but many of the affidavits upon which decisions would have to be made would be documents from the USSR with no proof of the validity of signature, the contents of the document itself or any of the authorization by court officials as to whether it was appropriate or not.

I understand, of course, that the Attorney General has clearly been interested in this subject for some time. Indeed, as a result of that seminar Professor Yuri Lurij was involved in the discussions and was apparently one of the sources for the draftsmanship of the legislation we now have before us. The Attorney General accordingly was clearly interested in this subject, but we did not see in the dying several days of the last session whether we were going to have legislation or not, and I look forward to having a new bill proceeded with in this session of the Legislature.

On February 15 I gave the Attorney General a modest stimulus by suggesting that in the first week of a new session we should reintroduce the bill. I did not know whether that would stimulate him to proceed or not, but it was certainly my intention to do so. Accordingly, on April 19 I again introduced Bill 8, which was a copy of Bill 87, which had been before the House, now in the present form that we see, Bill 8.

This legislation's time certainly has come. We have been talking over this subject for well over two years, and it is a serious matter that affects a lot of people and is a concern to them, particularly among the ethnic communities in Metro-

politan Toronto. As one who has received much support and consideration from those communities, as has the Attorney General, it is certainly an area about which we must be mindful and proceed to deal with this legislation.

Now at last we have before us Bill 29. It is, of course, a copy of that Bill 1 effectively, which was proceeded with several years ago. Just two weeks after its introduction, here we are debating it on second reading.

As I have mentioned, there is a particular problem, and this bill proceeds to deal with portions of that problem. It deals particularly with the requirement that our court must be satisfied both that a beneficiary is entitled to the payment and that he or she will receive substantially the full amount. Those are the two themes of this bill.

I suggest to members that the bill I had presented before the Legislature as Bill 8 would go further and might be better legislation. It might be better, for example, because in addition to deciding whether the beneficiary is entitled to a bequest and is likely to receive the full amount, the court would also be empowered to determine what would have been the wishes of the deceased person. That is, of course, particularly relevant in cases where no will has been left and where Soviet authorities have made claims on behalf of potential beneficiaries. For those cases the bill would have permitted the courts to hear a broader range of evidence than might normally be allowed, including evidence relating to the deceased person's intention.

Where it is clear that the deceased would never have either anticipated or intended that any payment be made to a beneficiary behind the Iron Curtain, the court could decide that no such payment would be made or it could decide that under the circumstances the estate could pass instead to other remaining relatives outside the communist bloc countries rather than tie the estate up in a trust for someone who might never be able to benefit from it.

In the comments the Attorney General made on first reading he suggested that those aspects of my Bill 8 amounted to confiscation and said he did not feel able to support that theme. I would ask him to reconsider, because I think there is the opportunity to base a better decision in circumstances such as these cases bring to us than we are going to see through the government legislation. I look forward to having the Attorney General consider the broader use of

evidence and the ability of the courts to look behind some of the documentation that is presented.

Our bill would apply to real estate that might be transferred by way of succession law. Of course, it is more specific in its approach to the various situations involved. It would allow our courts to consider the broader range of factors, and I suggest it would be useful.

We on this side of the House will support this

legislation. It has taken several years to bring forward. I know the Attorney General has looked forward to proceeding with the bill and for a variety of reasons, some beyond his control, was not able to do so until now. I commend the suggestions made in the companion legislation I have introduced and the changes presented in Bill 8. It would allow the courts a broader opportunity, and I suggest it might be worthy of consideration.

The House recessed at 6 p.m.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, May 17, 1983

Statements by the ministry

Davis, Hon. W. G., Premier:

Women's issues ministerial appointment 800

Henderson, Hon. L. C., Provincial Secretary for Resources Development:

Indian band agreement 799

Oral questions

Bennett, Hon. C. F., Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing:

Donations to political parties, Mr. Philip, Mr. Peterson, Mr. O'Neil 811

Grossman, Hon. L. S., Minister of Health:

Inspection of nursing homes, Mr. McClellan 807

Assistive devices program, Mr. T. P. Reid 808

Hospital beds, Mr. Roy, Mr. Cassidy 810

Norton, Hon. K. C., Minister of the Environment:

Toxic waste disposal, Mr. Peterson, Mr. Charlton, Mr. Elston 804

Ramsay, Hon. R. H., Minister of Labour:

Right to refuse work, Mr. Wildman, Mr. Bradley 809

Welch, Hon. R. S., Minister of Energy and Deputy Premier:

Women's issues, Mr. Peterson, Ms. Bryden, Mr. Wrye 801

Women apprentices, Ms. Bryden, Ms. Copps, Mr. Foulds 805

French-language services, Mr. Boudria 812

Report

Select committee on the Ombudsman, Mr. Runciman, tabled 813

First reading

Incorporation of Val Rita-Harty Act, Bill Pr25, Mr. Piché, agreed to 813

Second readings

Missionary Church, Canada East Act, Bill Pr4, Mrs. Scrivener, agreed to 813

Dave Holliday Limited Act, Bill Pr8, Mr. McKessock, agreed to 813

Thunder Bay United Church Camps Incorporated Act, Bill Pr10, Mr. Hennessy, agreed to 813

Thomas-Hamilton-Webber Limited Act, Bill Pr11, Mr. Van Horne, agreed to 813

Church of the Virgin Mary and St. Athanasius Act, Bill Pr16, Mr. Jones, agreed to 813

Landlord and Tenant Amendment Act, Bill 32, Mr. McMurtry, Mr. Epp, Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Ruprecht, Mr. Philip, agreed to 813

Provincial Courts Amendment Act, Bill 1, Mr. McMurtry, Mr. Breithaupt, Mr. Renwick, agreed to 824

Solicitors Amendment Act, Bill 25, Mr. McMurtry, Mr. Breithaupt, Mr. Renwick, agreed to 827

Small Claims Courts Amendment Act, Bill 28, Mr. McMurtry, Mr. Breithaupt, Mr. Renwick, Mr. Cassidy, agreed to 829

Estates Administration Amendment Act, Bill 29, Mr. McMurtry, Mr. Breithaupt, adjourned 834

Third readings

Missionary Church, Canada East Act , Bill Pr4, Mrs. Scrivener, agreed to.	813
Dave Holliday Limited Act , Bill Pr8, Mr. McKessock, agreed to.	813
Thunder Bay United Church Camps Incorporated Act , Bill Pr10, Mr. Hennessy, agreed to. .	813
Thomas-Hamilton-Webber Limited Act , Bill Pr11, Mr. Van Horne, agreed to.	813
Church of the Virgin Mary and St. Athanasius Act , Bill Pr16, Mr. Jones, agreed to.	813
Toronto Futures Exchange Act , Bill 7, Mr. Elgie, agreed to.	813

Other business

Similarity of bills , Mr. Speaker.	799
Inspection of nursing homes , Mr. McClellan.	799
Recess	837

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Ashe, Hon. G. L., Minister of Revenue (Durham West PC)
 Bennett, Hon. C. F., Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Ottawa South PC)
 Boudria, D. (Prescott-Russell L)
 Bradley, J. J. (St. Catharines L)
 Breithaupt, J. R. (Kitchener L)
 Bryden, M. H. (Beaches-Woodbine NDP)
 Cassidy, M. (Ottawa Centre NDP)
 Charlton, B. A. (Hamilton Mountain NDP)
 Copps, S. M. (Hamilton Centre L)
 Cousens, D., Deputy Chairman and Acting Speaker (York Centre PC)
 Cureatz, S. L., Deputy Speaker and Chairman (Durham East PC)
 Davis, Hon. W. G., Premier (Brampton PC)
 Elston, M. J. (Huron-Bruce L)
 Epp, H. A. (Waterloo North L)
 Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP)
 Grossman, Hon. L. S., Minister of Health (St. Andrew-St. Patrick PC)
 Henderson, Hon. L. C., Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Lambton PC)
 Johnston, R. F. (Scarborough West NDP)
 Laughren, F. (Nickel Belt NDP)
 Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
 McClellan, R. A. (Bellwoods NDP)
 McMurtry, Hon. R. R., Attorney General (Eglinton PC)
 Norton, Hon. K. C., Minister of the Environment (Kingston and the Islands PC)
 O'Neil, H. P. (Quinte L)
 Peterson, D. R. (London Centre L)
 Philip, E. T. (Etobicoke NDP)
 Ramsay, Hon. R. H., Minister of Labour (Sault Ste. Marie PC)
 Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L-Lab.)
 Renwick, J. A. (Riverdale NDP)
 Roy, A. J. (Ottawa East L)
 Runciman, R. W. (Leeds PC)
 Ruprecht, T. (Parkdale L)
 Stokes, J. E. (Lake Nipigon NDP)
 Swart, M. L. (Welland-Thorold NDP)
 Turner, Hon. J. M., Speaker (Peterborough PC)
 Welch, Hon. R. S., Minister of Energy and Deputy Premier (Brock PC)
 Wildman, B. (Algoma NDP)
 Wrye, W. M. (Windsor-Sandwich L)



Hansard

Official Report of Debates

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Third Session, 32nd Parliament

Tuesday, May 17, 1983

Evening Sitting

Speaker: Honourable John M. Turner

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

Contents of the proceedings reported in this issue of Hansard appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of the speakers taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is \$15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, Information Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 965-2238.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Tuesday, May 17, 1983

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

ESTATES ADMINISTRATION AMENDMENT ACT (concluded)

Resuming the debate on the motion for second reading of Bill 29, An Act to amend the Estates Administration Act.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, if anybody in the assembly wants to have a friendly fingerprint taken by the Metropolitan Toronto Police, he can go up to Sherway Plaza tonight. The police want to accustom us as best they can to the whole process. One can visit a bomb shelter or have a friendly fingerprint taken. They did not say anything about a friendly photograph. Apparently the police want to acclimatize us to having our fingerprints taken.

Mr. Breithaupt: It is not even 1984.

Mr. Renwick: Not yet.

I know the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry) will want to put this bill into committee; so we will not have to request that it go into committee, but I am going to suggest that it does.

Unfortunately, this is one of the occasions on which I agree with the Attorney General and disagree with the critic for the official opposition, my good friend the member for Kitchener (Mr. Breithaupt) with respect to Bill 29.

Our caucus will support the bill. Our caucus has agreed that we will support the bill on second reading. We agree with the end which the bill attempts to achieve. But achieving that end is a lot more difficult than I think my friend the member for Kitchener will agree or, I am sure, the Attorney General has found in the length of time it has taken to get the bill in a position where he was prepared to proceed with it.

I am not certain. I do not have the connections with the community of concern that the member for Kitchener obviously has, but I want to say to the member for Kitchener that I would be extremely concerned if the Attorney General were to accept the extension of the bill, meritorious as it may appear for the purposes of the end, to the question of what will happen to those funds and to provide through the court

some method by which a redirection of funds could take place.

I do not think one can fool around in an oblique way with the fundamental question with respect to the devolution of estates and the way in which property can be dealt with. If one is going to deal with it in a way different from the expressed, written intentions of a testator or the expressed statutory provisions of the province on the death of a person, then I think one has to have compelling reasons for doing so.

To ask the court to do so in the sense that it is to reinterpret the intention of the testator or in some way try to come to a conclusion about what a testator or a person dying intestate may have desired with respect to the disposition of his property is a course on which one should not embark lightly, at least in my view of the question.

We support the intention involved in the bill, but I have serious concerns about achieving the goal the bill is intended to achieve. In my view, that is reflected in the language of the bill. For that reason we would like to discuss the principles of the bill in committee.

One can be quite certain that if there is a significant number of dollars tied up in estates because of this bill, there will be any number of efforts made to divert those funds to persons other than a testator, or the laws of this province in the case of an intestacy, would have provided.

I recognize that I speak without the ambit of authority with which the member for Kitchener, who has been interested in this bill for some considerable time, speaks about it. Indeed, I think it is fair to say that the first I heard of this problem was from the former leader of the official opposition, and it was the first occasion I had to consider it. Therefore I would like to have the opportunity to explore in a give-and-take way exactly what this bill does say when it is in committee of the whole House.

We have no amendments to propose, but it is the kind of bill which, even though it has been drafted in a careful way, raises some questions in my mind about what we are asking the courts of the province to do with personal property that would otherwise go in one direction, which is to divert that money in another direction.

For example, I am particularly concerned where, on the application, the money does not go the way in which either the laws of the province on an intestacy or the laws of the province in the case of a testacy respecting the will of the testator would direct it to go.

Even in the low-key way in which it is expressed in the bill, I have a concern about the provisions of subsection 4 where it says: "Where, upon an application under subsection (2)"—of course, the subsection should read "subsection 3," not "2" as printed in the bill—"the court is satisfied that a person other than a foreign beneficiary is entitled to the personal property, the court may by order direct its distribution to the person entitled."

I think that is an immensely onerous provision to impose on the courts. I do not pretend to know the answer, but I do think the record of the debate of this assembly on this rather extraordinary bill should show that we have considered the implications of it in supporting it, as we do in this party, because of the concerns I have expressed.

8:10 p.m.

I am not quite certain whether the member for Kitchener has discussed with his friend the member for Waterloo North (Mr. Epp) the implications of the proposal made by the member for Kitchener in the light of the resolution of the member for Waterloo North with respect to entrenching property in the constitution of Ontario.

Perhaps during the dinner hour the member for Kitchener has had an opportunity to talk with the member for Waterloo North and can enlighten us on the resolution of the apparent conflict which I see in the proposal he makes, which the Attorney General would say in a very soft, understated way was confiscation of property.

With those remarks on second reading, we would like the bill to go into committee of the whole house; but I understand the Attorney General will put it into committee because of the numerical errors in subsections 4 and 5.

Mr. Shymko: Mr. Speaker, I join the honourable members from the opposition in speaking in support of this bill. I am very happy, as we all are, that there is obvious unanimity in support of the act to amend the Estates Administration Act, namely, Bill 29.

I do concur with the previous speaker that perhaps for the benefit of those who are not aware of the details of the implications and tragic consequences of some of the actions

taken by legal representatives on behalf of relatives in the Soviet Union, this should be discussed in committee because of the educational nature of what we are trying to do.

I wish to point out that over the past number of years, as the member for Kitchener certainly knows, various delegations have approached both the governing parties and the parties of the opposition, not only here in the Legislative Assembly but also at the federal level, to take some action to stop the shameful exploitation of estates by certain governments, and more specifically the governments of Communist regimes in central and eastern Europe.

What is tragic is that more than \$10 million a year, the figure I have seen, is ripped off from Canadians by these actions. This is a form of blackmail and often leads to fear. Hard currency is something these regimes are after. I do not have to remind the members that Canadians of Czech and Slovak origin are required to pay between \$2,000 and \$5,000 if they want to renounce their citizenship. This is a very interesting example of how these regimes are seeking hard currency.

The procedure for obtaining hard currency is outlined by the manner in which the regimes collect it. First of all, if there is a beneficiary in the Soviet Union, for example, they demand that the estate be delivered in hard currency, not in parcels, even if a will left by the deceased states the beneficiary should obtain the estate money in or through parcels rather than in hard currency.

Very often, as the member for Kitchener has indicated, the Iron Curtain representative—and the prominent lawyer Gordon Price is a classic example—has demanded that if an application is made to Ontario, these applications specify that Ontario courts, on behalf of the beneficiary, change the manner of payment from parcels to hard currency.

If they do not succeed in their court action, an unprecedented heavy tax or duty, often five times that normally paid on parcels going to the Soviet Union, is imposed on these parcels. So the first thing the Soviet representative has always demanded is that the payment be in cash.

I do not have to remind honourable members that the real rate of exchange is less than the official rate of exchange of one dollar to one rouble. Currently on the black market in the Soviet Union the exchange is 80 roubles per US dollar, a little less for the Canadian dollar—from three to 12 times the official value of our currency.

It is interesting that in April 1983 in Radianska Ukraina, the largest-circulation daily of the Soviet Ukraine, there was an ad on behalf of the Soviet version of our Canadian Bar Association, an organization called In Jure Collegium. This ad called for people to come forward and indicate whether they had any relatives who had died in Canada, the United States or any of the countries outside the Soviet Union.

There is no doubt that great efforts are made to keep tabs on our senior citizens and to keep track of the obituaries in our dailies and in the ethnic press so that immediate action may be taken to proceed with an estate.

This collegium, or Soviet bar association, automatically collects 10 per cent of the estate before the case is even presented here in Canada. In addition to this, men such as Mr. Gordon Price, the well-known representative of the Soviet Union in this area of Ontario, collect a fee whose amount to this day we do not know.

There is also an estate tax, the figure of which we do not know, which is collected by the Soviet government; in addition, there is a local administration tax. So, as the member for Kitchener has pointed out, sometimes no more than 10 per cent of the original value of the estate finally ends up with the beneficiary.

I do not have to remind the members of the famous Toronto Star front-page announcement three years ago concerning the Ivan Franco senior citizen home in my constituency. All of a sudden a representative for Mr. Gordon Price appeared and said he would like to have details about Mr. So-and-So because of his estate. The man was still alive, and here they were ready to collect payment on a person who had not even been given a chance to leave this world. That is the type of urgency the Soviet Union has for hard currency.

I do not have to tell the members of cases of fraud or of forgeries. We have no control whatsoever today over the veracity of many of these beneficiaries.

I would like to point out that if a will has been drawn up, usually the Soviet government or its representatives are not as eager to contest it. But that challenge would be before the court. Many of these communities are seriously concerned and educating their members to draw up wills that will offer some protection to their estate when they are not around any more. That educative process is certainly recognized and is being stressed by various organizations, church groups and so on.

8:20 p.m.

I stress that the member for Kitchener is to be congratulated on the initiatives he has taken on the part of Her Majesty's loyal opposition to sensitize all of us to this terrible ripoff of Ontarians and Canadians. I certainly congratulate the Attorney General for the determination to have this bill presented and passed before this House adjourns.

There are those of us who may have had the impression or may have tried to give the impression that there was no willingness on the part of this government to reintroduce the bill, that it was a pure façade of concern with no genuine intention. As a member of the caucus and having spoken to the Attorney General, I point out that we were ready last year to proceed with this bill. I will not say the time consumed in the ringing of bells and other incidents was the greatest obstacle that stopped the Attorney General from proceeding, but rather the other priorities, perhaps exaggerated, of some opposition members.

I give total credit and recognition to the member for Kitchener for his sensitivity, his understanding and his willingness today to support the bill and not to play around with amendments and other things. He is to be congratulated.

I wish to point out that most of these people have relatives—be they parents or their own children; and it is by force of tragic circumstances they are not with them today—and they would like these benefits to return to them. I do not have to outline that, no matter how terrible the Communist regimes feel this capitalist system of free enterprise is, they are certainly trying to rip off as much as they can from our system and the land of opportunity these people where these people have lived and cherished our free democratic society and free enterprise system.

There is a desire that the beneficiaries receive maximum benefit from the estate. The intent of the Attorney General and this bill is to assess whether the property will be unduly depleted and to guarantee a maximum return for the beneficiaries.

Most important, what this legislation will do is to signal to the Soviet Union and to other regimes in central and eastern Europe that they will not be able to play this game of exploitation as blatantly as they have in the past. That is the importance of this legislation.

With time, perhaps we will see whether some of the aspects that are termed as confiscatory in the member for Kitchener's bill will need to be

implemented. We will see whether further amendments are needed.

I certainly support the bill and, in doing so, I point out that it is one of those very few occasions in the House when there is unanimity among all members in understanding an area that is of acute need because of the tragedy involved.

Mr. Kolyn: Mr. Speaker, it is certainly a pleasure for me to make a few comments on Bill 29. I have been looking forward to the bill coming here and being passed.

I would like to thank the member for Kitchener for his support and dogged determination to keep the issue alive. The member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick) indicated he supports the bill in principle. Last but not least, the Attorney General should be thanked for giving this all the consideration he has given it, because it is a rather complicated bill.

I am not a lawyer, nor do I profess to be, but I have been involved with this for the past couple of years. Mr. Roy Kostuk has been involved in this type of operation and has always pointed out the pitfalls he has had when it came to wills and estates that went back to Iron Curtain countries.

With that, on behalf of all the ethnic communities, I thank the Attorney General for bringing the bill forward. I hope we will see it passed very soon.

Mr. G. I. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I also want to take a few moments to pass on some comments. I think the bill has come about because of some urging from my riding of Haldimand-Norfolk. I know there were a couple of legal firms concerned. They dealt for many years with many foreign countries, such as the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia. They had their families there.

It came to my attention that some changes should be made, which were passed along to my colleague the member for Kitchener and I think were passed on to the Attorney General.

I am certainly pleased some changes are going to be made to make sure that estate money earned here in Canada and Ontario will go to the proper people rather than to the state. Again I would like to congratulate my colleague and the Attorney General.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, this is an issue about which emotions can run deeply for understandable reasons. The thought of a Communist government ripping off estates, as has been expressed, is obviously a matter that has caused a great deal of concern within our

Ontario community, a concern harboured by many of our citizens.

At the same time, it is important to keep in context the fact that governments do tax estates. In Ontario, we used to have something known as succession duty, and there used to be currency regulations of one kind or another; so the idea of governments benefiting as a result of a succession is not entirely a novel one.

This is legislation that is important and an issue about which we have been very concerned because fundamental to our concerns is that while, in the words of the legislation, we do not wish these estates to be "unduly depleted," on the other hand we do wish to respect the wishes of a testator and the fact that it is important the beneficiaries receive some degree of entitlement.

It is unfortunate that this legislation has not proceeded before. I attempted earlier to explain to colleagues the matter of not having sufficient House time. There were also concerns about the actual wording of the legislation. But it is quite clear that members from all parties are determined to get this legislation passed well before the end of the sittings. For this, I am very appreciative.

I appreciate that the member for Kitchener has made a thoughtful presentation in respect to his Bill 8. Without taking an undue period of time, I want to read into the record some of our concerns with his efforts, which were certainly well motivated and obviously the result of a good deal of care and effort on his part. These are several of our concerns:

"Firstly, since the purpose of the legislation is to ensure that beneficiaries will receive substantially the full value of any payments, it is unnecessary to extend the bill to real property. The beneficiary takes the property in specie, which is hardly ever done. The foreign government is powerless to seize a portion of it for itself. The land is converted to money before distribution. It then becomes personal property.

"In cases of intestacy and claims on estates by dependants, the intentions of the deceased are very difficult to determine and may well be irrelevant." As a matter of fact, they usually are irrelevant. "Regardless of intention, the law of Ontario provides that certain people are entitled to inherit property on the death of a person domiciled in Ontario or to make a claim for support against the estate.

"To rewrite the law only for potential beneficiaries in eastern European countries seems to us to be extremely unfair.

8:30 p.m.

"The private member's bill of the member for Kitchener, in our respectful view, goes beyond its stated intention, which is to ensure that payments are not made to foreign beneficiaries who are unlikely to receive substantially the full value of any payment. Even if a court decides that a beneficiary is entitled to the property and is likely to receive substantially the full value of the payment, the court can still refuse to direct any payment where it feels it would not be just and equitable, having regard to the intentions of the deceased person to do so.

"I should also like to state that a principle of the government legislation is that it is a custodial statute and is procedural in nature. It offers no threat to an heir's right to inherit, but his right to possession is held in abeyance until certain conditions have been satisfied. The estate is held in trust until the court is satisfied that the property will not be unduly depleted before it is received by the beneficiary.

"The private member's bill, in our respectful view," as I stated when I introduced the bill again, "is confiscatory in nature. Unless the court is satisfied that a beneficiary will receive the substantial benefit of the payment and that it is just and equitable, having regard to the intentions of the deceased, the beneficiary can be forever excluded from the estate. If there are no other heirs, the estate would cede to the crown. In our view, there simply is no justification for this approach."

I have read these comments into the record not to engage in an unnecessary or prolonged debate with my respected colleague the member for Kitchener, but to indicate to him that my advisers looked at his bill very carefully and they respected the effort that had gone into its preparation. I did not want him to think we were just dismissing it out of hand because it was a private member's bill. I am still mindful of the fact that he is the same private member who introduced the first amendment to our historic family law legislation, which was accepted and passed. That is an indication of our respect on this side of the House for the member for Kitchener.

I just wanted to indicate to him that we had looked at his bill very carefully. We respected the motives that prompted it, and I wanted to let him know that some thought had gone into our rejection of this approach. It is obvious whatever legislation is passed is going to have to be monitored. I should say in conclusion there is no doubt that much of the problem can probably not be alleviated totally satisfactorily by any

legislation. It simply requires a significant educational effort and educational initiatives in the community that is concerned about this problem, so that wills may be properly drafted. I think they can be drafted in such a way as to avoid to a considerable extent some of the problems that arise, for example, in the very nature of the bequest.

As an illustration, if the testator wishes the beneficiary to benefit, it has been suggested that where we are talking about hard currency, instead of "hard currency," there could be "monthly packages of clothing" and other matter such as that. That is one approach that has been suggested. Quite apart from any legislative initiatives, which are important, there is no question that the educational value of a campaign to ensure that people, for example, do not die intestate and that their wills are properly drawn, probably in the long run will be more effective than any legislation.

I certainly would like to thank as well my distinguished colleagues, the member for High Park-Swansea (Mr. Shymko) and the member for Lakeshore (Mr. Kolyn) for their encouragement and their participation in the drafting of this legislation. I assume, Mr. Speaker, that this legislation is going to go to committee of the whole House and there will be an opportunity there to discuss further some of the issues that have been raised, particularly those issues raised by the member for Riverdale.

Motion agreed to.

Bill ordered for committee of the whole House.

House in committee of the whole.

LANDLORD AND TENANT AMENDMENT ACT

Consideration of Bill 32, An Act to amend the Landlord and Tenant Act.

On section 1:

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Philip moves that section 1 of the bill be amended by deleting the word "six" in line 2 of clause (c) of subsection 7 of the amended section 107 of the Landlord and Tenant Act and substituting therefor the word "four."

Mr. Philip: In moving this amendment I might indicate to the House that I have noted that at the same time I drafted this amendment, the Liberal Party drafted a similar one. They are both equal, and therefore it matters little which of us moves the amendment because we both had the same idea at the same time independently.

I wonder, Mr. Chairman, since my next amendment is a complementary amendment—it deals with section 2 of the bill and in effect deals with the same issue—if we might consider them both together and allow me to move my amendment to section 2. I think that will speed up the process somewhat.

Mr. Chairman: I would be willing to do that, except your first amendment deals with clause 107(7)(c) as set out in section 1 of the bill, does it not?

Mr. Philip: Yes, essentially though they deal with the same problem. What we are trying to do is to make this bill apply to all buildings which have four or more units, rather than six or more units. That is the essential thrust of both of these amendments. I would suggest that we will save some time if we debate that issue by moving the two amendments.

Mr. Chairman: I am in complete sympathy but I think that we do have a procedural problem of trying to deal with two amendments on the floor at the same time. I think we will just have to stick to the one.

8:40 p.m.

Mr. Philip: The purpose of this amendment, Mr. Chairman, is very simple. What we are dealing with is the fact that a great number of buildings will be exempt if the bill is passed in its present form. I am suggesting that the area that has been most affected, namely the community of Lakeshore, has a great number of six-plexes. A six-plex is not the kind of building normally bought by families.

While I can understand that the minister in bringing in his bill, Bill 32, would want to exempt small family buildings, I suggest that six units is high. It will simply mean that the very people we are trying to stop from evicting tenants—those merchandisers of that process of selling a building as a percentage interest with an allocation of an apartment and evicting the tenants in that process—will simply start merchandising smaller buildings using the same method and evicting the same kind of tenants.

In areas such as Lakeshore, where we have had some 800 tenants affected by the present end run around the Condominium Act, and the Attorney General has seen fit to respond to tenants and the opposition by introducing Bill 32, those same people will simply go and merchandise smaller buildings. That is the reason both the New Democratic Party and the Liberals saw this problem. We have moved that we simply reduce the size to four.

That will still allow families to buy a building and have provision for apartments for the grandparents and the sons and daughters. We think that four is a reasonable substitute.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Chairman, about whether it is the figure “four” or “six,” as I said earlier, it is something about which reasonable people can disagree. Both the member for Etobicoke (Mr. Philip) and the government caucus are attempting to accomplish the same thing by maintaining some degree of flexibility for families or people who have a close association.

With the greatest respect, on this issue of four or six to accommodate what we thought was a legitimate concern for families or people of close association, we thought we should leave it at six. This was the result of a debate. Whether the number “four” would be better as time goes on, only our experience will be the appropriate guide.

I urge the member for Etobicoke to consider that we have moved this legislation ahead, certainly in part as a result of his urging and that of other members of the Legislature. If it turns out that the figure “six” is a problem from the standpoint of people marketing this type of unit, then it is something we can look at again. But I am afraid I do not have any authorization at this point to take the figure “six” and substitute for it the figure “four.”

I would like to give the member for Etobicoke my assurance that if this turns out to be something that is being abused and people are being evicted as a result of individuals who do not have any particular relationship entering into occupancy agreements, this is something we can consider down the line.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Philip has moved an amendment to section 1.

All those in favour will please say “aye.”

All those opposed will please say “nay.”

In my opinion the nays have it.

Vote stacked.

Mr. Philip: Mr. Chairman, I have some questions to the minister on section 1 since we are in committee of the whole. It is on the principle of the bill that one may ask a fairly wide range of questions.

I have been raising this problem over a number of years as different lawyers come up with different ways of getting around the condominium conversion bylaws. The minister indicated he would be meeting with the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Mr. Bennett) and the Minister of Consumer and Commercial

Relations (Mr. Elgie) to discuss this problem and would be bringing forth legislation within 10 days. He almost made his deadline and I congratulate him on that.

Can the minister give us any indication whether there is any legislation forthcoming from those three ministries, particularly the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, that would stop this problem once and for all? I am sure the minister understands this is a stopgap measure; it will prevent some 30 families from being evicted when they have their court hearings on May 30, but it really does not deal with—

Interjection.

Mr. Philip: There are 30 that I know of. There may be even more. None the less, we do know there are at least 30 that are scheduled for court hearings on one day alone this month. Some estimates indicate there are as many as 3,000 who may be affected by this bill.

Can the minister give us any indication of the results of those conversations with those ministers and of whether some substantial legislation to stop this practice once and for all, such as an amendment to the Planning Act, might be forthcoming?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Is this vote going to be stacked until 10:15 p.m.?

Mr. Chairman: No, he is just talking generally now.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I just wondered about—

Mr. Chairman: That is what I understood from members of the opposition. It is going to be stacked until the committee rises, which could be soon.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: The Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations is considering other legislation. I am sorry I cannot give the member for Etobicoke (Mr. Philip) any time frame.

I think the member is being quite fair. I do not want to be quarrelsome about it, but this 10 days was not the time frame for introducing the legislation; it was the time frame within which I would state the intention of the government. It is true I was just outside the time frame, but we did introduce the legislation on the same day.

The Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations is considering other legislation. I cannot give a commitment on behalf of that ministry that they will be introducing legislation prior to the report of the Thom commission. It is quite conceivable they will. I do not know of any intention on the part of the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Mr. Bennett) to intro-

duce legislation in this area in the foreseeable future, but that is a question that could be directed to the minister during question period.

On section 2:

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Philip moves that section 2 of the bill be amended by deleting the word "six" in line 2 of clause (a) of the new subsection 4 of the amended section 110 of the Landlord and Tenant Act and substituting therefor the word "four."

Mr. Philip: The arguments are the same, Mr. Chairman.

8:50 p.m.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Philip has moved an amendment to section 2.

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion the nays have it.

Vote stacked.

Sections 3 and 4 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: We cannot do section 5. We will stand the bill down.

SMALL CLAIMS COURTS AMENDMENT ACT

Consideration of Bill 28, An Act to amend the Small Claims Courts Act.

On section 1:

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, when we were speaking on second reading this afternoon in connection with section 1 of the bill to amend the Small Claims Courts Act, Bill 28, which is before us, I raised the question of the tenure of officers of the courts. We were speaking about the clerks, bailiffs and referees of the small claims court. The Attorney General very properly and appropriately, because of what the statute provides, simply said, "That is the way it is in all the courts." That is exactly the issue I want to raise with him.

I am quite aware that under section 83 of the Judicature Act provision is made with respect to the Supreme Court as follows: "There shall be such officers of the Supreme Court as are considered necessary by the Lieutenant Governor in Council for the due dispatch of the business of the court, and such officers, subject to section" so and so, which is not applicable in this case, "shall be appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council."

I am also aware that the Interpretation Act specifically provides that authority to the Lieutenant Governor to make an appointment to an office shall be deemed authority to appoint

during pleasure. Not being particularly knowledgeable about these matters, I had assumed the tenure of the officers of the Supreme Court was somewhat more secure than the provisions relating to the clerks, bailiffs and referees of the small claims court. That did not turn out to be the case and I was surprised. I had never had occasion to look at that.

I suppose the two contrasting poles are appointment during pleasure on the one hand and appointment during good behaviour on the other hand, illustrated by the present status of the clerks of the small claims court, for example, who have the least secure tenure and the judges of the Supreme Court of Canada, for example, who have the most secure tenure, because they are removable only upon the address of both Houses of Parliament.

I had a sensation that in the area in between it was about time we looked at the question of tenure with respect to the principal officers of those courts where the great bulk of the citizenry come in touch with the system, which are the small claims courts. In due course when occasion arises, when the bill the Attorney General has referred to—I think he refers to it as the administration of the courts act?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: The Courts of Justice Act.

Mr. Renwick: The Courts of Justice Act: when that comes before the assembly we may have a more extended opportunity to look into this question.

It did seem appropriate to raise the point of the nature of tenure of the court officers in the little time that was available to do it. I did notice that in the Judicature Act there are significant provisions for protecting the Masters of the Supreme Court; it is set out in some detail in section 96 of the Judicature Act.

It was with that in mind that I simply adapted those provisions for the purpose of the amendment which I would like to propose to section 1 of this bill, so that we could have both the proposed amendment on the record in the interests of furthering a discussion of this kind of question, have a brief discussion about it and then let the matter lay at this point where it would fall with the suggestion.

Basically, my position is, I would be very concerned if the principal officials of all of the courts, the provincial courts and the Supreme Court, did not have some clarity with respect to the process by which they could be removed from office.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Renwick moves that section 20 of the Small Claims Courts Act, set out in section 1 of Bill 28, be amended to read as follows:

"(1) There shall be a clerk and one or more bailiffs for every small claims court who shall be appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council on the recommendation of the Attorney General.

"(2) The Lieutenant Governor in Council may appoint a referee for each small claims court, on the recommendation of the Attorney General.

"(3) A clerk, bailiff, or referee may be removed from office before attaining retirement age only for misbehavior or for inability to perform his duties properly, and only if,

"(a) the circumstances respecting the misbehavior or inability are first inquired into; and

"(b) the clerk, bailiff or referee is given reasonable notice of the time and place for the enquiry and is afforded an opportunity by himself or his counsel of being heard and of cross-examining the witnesses and producing evidence on his own behalf.

"(4) For the purpose of making an enquiry the Lieutenant Governor in Council may appoint a judge of the county court who shall make the enquiry and report therein and a judge so appointed has for that purpose the powers of the commission under part II of the Public Enquiries Act, which part applies to such enquiry if it were an enquiry under that act.

"(5) An order removing a clerk, bailiff or referee from office under this section may be made by the Lieutenant Governor in Council and the order and report of the enquiry shall be laid before the Legislative Assembly if it is in session or, if not, within 15 days after the commencement of the next ensuing session.

"(6) Every clerk, bailiff or referee shall retire upon attaining the age of 65 years.

"(7) Upon attaining an age for retirement under subsection 6 a clerk, bailiff or referee may be reappointed to hold office during any period but shall not hold office after attaining the age of 70 years.

"(8) A clerk, bailiff or referee may at any time resign his office in writing signed by him and delivered to the Attorney General."

Mr. Renwick: In speaking, if I may, to that amendment, I believe it is self-explanatory. It may appear somewhat unduly elaborate with respect to the provisions of the due process involved, and for the terms of the tenure which are provided, but I do commend it, at least the

thought contained in it, to the consideration of the Attorney General. I think it would be a wise move for us to make, when one considers that officers of the court, as distinct perhaps from other employees, have a split authority with respect to their appointment, and I refer particularly to the comments made by the Chief Justice of Ontario at the opening of the court when he was commenting on the committee that reported on the Deschênes report on the independent judicial administration of the courts. It makes this distinction.

9 p.m.

Among the matters that must be—I emphasize must be—within control of the judges is that of the activity of court personnel but not their salaries or the general terms of their employment. In that particular unusual division of the authority with respect to those officers I do believe they should be entitled to some higher degree of protection than merely to hold their office during pleasure, which, so far as I know, is the most insecure form of tenure known to the English law.

I would submit that this amendment deserves consideration. I would appreciate a brief comment from the Attorney General about it.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Chairman, as I said earlier, this proposal is very interesting. It is certainly without precedent, considering the nature of the employment of these clerks and registrars in the court system outside the small claims court.

I indicated earlier that I would be unable to accept the amendment, but I would like to express my appreciation to the member for Riverdale in so far as putting forward the amendment is concerned because, as he suggested, it will form the basis for further discussion. It is a useful document to have for that purpose, certainly, at the very least.

This would be a very substantial, very significant and very far-reaching amendment. In my view it would be unwise to accept it without a lot of careful thought and consideration. However, as the member has stated, it is on the record. It will be the subject matter of further discussion, and certainly if we were to make such an amendment we would have great difficulty in making such an important amendment separate and apart from our new courts of justice legislation.

I accept this very significant and far-reaching amendment proposal on the basis that it will be the subject for further discussion in relation to

this very important and comprehensive legislation, which will involve all of the courts under the title of the Courts of Justice Act.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that the Attorney General has accepted it pretty much in the spirit in which I proposed it, and I think the germ of the idea reflected in this brief consideration of it is well worth exploring.

Mr. Chairman: All those in favour of Mr. Renwick's amendment will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion the nays have it.

Motion negatived.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 4:

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I simply want to refer to what the compendium says that was provided with the bill. Section 4 provides for interest to run on small claims court judgements at the same rate as in Supreme Court, county court and district court judgements. Previously, interest could run on a judgement only where it was enforced by seizure and sale of goods. Since few judgements are enforced by seizure and sale, the previous law was very inequitable to judgement creditors.

Section 5 was complementary to section 4. I have no problem with section 5, because it was for practical purposes to remove the particular provision and provide it in this more omnibus one.

My comments this afternoon were quite simple and direct. There is nothing I know other than a spurious logic that would tell us at this point in the history of the small claims courts in Ontario that we should provide for an interest on judgement. We have never had it before; that we should have it at this point simply in order that it would accord with the same interest as in the Supreme Court and the county and district courts is not to my mind a reason.

I suppose it can be reduced, as the Attorney General likes to reduce these things, to a philosophic difference. It is a practical philosophic difference in the judicial system because it runs entirely contrary to everything I have ever read about the nature of the small claims courts, the purposes for which they were instituted and the expeditious way in which they were to be operated. There is nothing that indicates to me that the provision of this kind of interest on judgements in the small claims courts will do anything either to speed up, delay or alter the settlement of judgements by judge-

ment debtors to their creditors. I rest my case at that.

We will never be able to persuade this government that the small claims court is not some kind of miniature Supreme Court but a qualitatively different court with a different concept and a different purpose, designed to ensure the speedy settlement of monetary disputes between citizens of the province in a way that is inimical to the lengthy processes reserved for the wealthier citizens of the province in the county courts and in the Supreme Court. All the jurisprudence, all the writings about the small claims court appear to have made no impression on the government of this province, because it now tends entirely to try simply to make the small claims court into some other kind of adjunct of the superior courts.

Anything that has been written in the last 30 years with respect to the need to reform the small claims court flies in the teeth of the proposed amendment. A spurious logic tells us that on this day of our Lord, May 17, 1983, this assembly should now agree that interest should run on judgements in the small claims court. Why, I do not know. I would have thought any kind of jurisprudential evidence would have been submitted to this assembly rather than a false and spurious Aristotelian logic in connection with it. It is for this reason that our party feels quite strongly about this view of those courts.

Of course, the constituents of most of the members sitting on the government benches deal only in the higher courts, so they are not faced with the problem. If you are in my riding, you go out to the small claims court in Scarborough. You have to get from Riverdale to the small claims court in Scarborough when somebody sues you for your account at Eaton's, for example, on the question of whether or not the equipment you received was any good. If you fail to pay and they sue you in that court, just imagine the amount of time you spend in public transportation getting to and from that court, without Eaton's having the luxury of a penalty provision with respect to interest imposed on the judgement, which the people in the Riverdale area have enough difficulty paying. They have enough difficulty competing against the persons who make these claims against them.

I take off my hat to nobody in connection with the obligation of people to settle their debts. But these courts are settling disputed debts when the settlement is made by the arbitrary judgement of the court, and the Attor-

ney General does not provide any information whatsoever except from the 18th floor, or whatever floor it is, at 18 King Street East, where they have decided it must accord with what is done in the county courts and the Supreme Court. I find that kind of approach to jurisprudence as it affects the people in the riding of Riverdale utterly without merit.

9:10 p.m.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Chairman, I think the member for Riverdale has somehow forgotten—and it is not usual for him—that in the small claims court there has been pre-judgement interest since 1977. Given his logical bent of mind, I would have thought that if we in this Legislature approved pre-judgement interest back in 1977, he would have seen some modest degree of logic in extending it to post-judgement interest.

I say with great respect to him that there is not a member of this Legislature who does not have a lot of ordinary people appearing in the small claims courts of this province. Certainly the majority of citizens who are likely to find themselves in civil court in the great riding of Eglinton are more likely to find themselves in a small claims court than in the other courts.

There is a further consideration. In cases where judgement creditors are going to the small claims court or would be persuaded to go to small claims court, in our view if interest is allowed, they are not going to be more likely to take it to a higher court if their claim can fall within that jurisdiction.

I think the very fact that we put the small claims court on the same basis as the other courts may encourage some litigants who might technically have a case that can be proven in the county court to restrict their claim to the small claims court jurisdiction with a saving of costs all around.

Sections 4 and 5 agreed to.

On section 6:

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, my point is again quite simple. Section 6 is going to provide for what is referred to in the compendium of information provided to us with the bill as some minor changes and so on. They are not particularly minor; they are going to grant to the collection agencies the authority to file executions against the land of a judgement debtor.

Assuming for the moment that judgement debtors in the small claims court have land, one will find in most of the cases—and I can state this just as categorically because there is no

other evidence available to contradict it—that it will be the home of the person. I do not happen to believe in this day and age that the collection of this kind of debt awarded in the small claims court should be at the expense of levying against the land of the person when in most cases it is his private home.

I do not know whether the Attorney General has any idea of the trauma most people feel if they find out they have an execution levied against their home. It certainly is very traumatic for elderly people and it is very traumatic for people who are not aware of all the ins and outs of the law.

The method of collecting debts through the bailiffs and through the courts is adequate without judgement creditors having the benefit of this ancient and time-worn method of levying against real property. In the bill the Attorney General said, "All right, if they do levy it, what does it really matter, because what we are going to do is make certain that once you have paid your bill, it will be the responsibility of the person who placed the execution on the property to take it off the property."

One can imagine how convenient that will be when one reads the provision that is going to be added to carry it out:

"Where an execution against lands has been filed with the sheriff and the judgement is fully satisfied, the judgement creditor or his agent shall cause the execution to be withdrawn promptly and shall be liable to the judgement debtor for any reasonably foreseeable loss resulting from failure to do so."

Again, if my friend the Chairman were able to speak and participate in this debate, as a practicing solicitor he would well know how fraught with nonsense that kind of provision is with respect to the irritation and the frustration that can be caused by a judgement debtor, who, having had this iniquitous execution levied against his land, pays up his account, which he intended to do in any event, and then finds some time later, of course, that there is still the execution levied against his land, because the collection agency or the client of the collection agency has not quite gotten around to lifting it.

The day he turns around to sell his house, of course, his solicitor says to him, "What about this execution against your land?" "Oh," he says, "I paid that." "Well, we will have to get rid of it. Who put it on?" "Well, so-and-so, but so-and-so is out of business now. How do we get it removed?" "Oh, you can make an application to the court." "Will that cost anything?" "Of course

it will cost—you know, a few dollars." That is how it will go.

We find that every time the encroachment is made upon ordinary people by the judicial system we have a little bit given on the other hand as though that evens the balance. I simply say to the Attorney General with all the force I can, and in the parliamentary way in which I want to say it, that the provision under the Small Claims Courts Act for executions to be levied against the land of judgement debtors, is iniquitous and it is contrary to the philosophy and the concept of the small claims court. It is a step backwards, I would like to think, only to the 18th century; it is probably a step backward to the feudal system in England in the 14th century. I and my caucus are quite opposed to this attitude that the Attorney General has towards small claims courts.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Chairman, I would like the member for Riverdale to tell the tens of thousands of ordinary small judgement creditors that he believes in having a small claims court system in which one can obtain judgements but one cannot enforce them. If that is what he wants, I do not think it would be acceptable to most of the ordinary folk in this province.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, let me just briefly respond. I am not against the enforcement of judgements. People should pay their debts; people should meet judgements made by the courts. But we do not need to give one party in the game an overwhelmingly strong position as against the other. The Attorney General knows that justice is generally known as a balance. There is an ancient statue of a blind person with two scales. It is a balance and it is an evenhanded proposition, and this is not evenhanded. Of course, it will have to await the incoming of a New Democratic Party government to deal properly with the Small Claims Courts Act, and I leave the matter at that point.

Sections 6 to 10, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill ordered to be reported.

ESTATES ADMINISTRATION AMENDMENT ACT

Consideration of Bill 29, An Act to amend the Estates Administration Act.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if in opening I should say that I am grateful to the member for Riverdale for pointing out, first of all, some typographical errors in the bill

as printed, and we will be introducing the appropriate amendments.

9:20 p.m.

I would also like to say I was interested in the comments of the member for Riverdale on subsection 19a(4) of the act as set out in subsection 1(1) of the bill in relation to foreign beneficiaries. As I understood his brief comments and as I directed my attention to that subsection, it was my view that there was some confusion on the basis of whether a person is or is not a beneficiary. I would like to say in opening that it is our intention to amend subsection 19a(4) by striking out the words "foreign beneficiary" and substituting therefor the words "person resident in a country designated by regulation under this section."

I wanted to make an opening statement in regard to the direction in which we were going, because I think the member for Riverdale made a very valid observation in relation to this section and the confusion. What we are trying to do in that subsection is to provide for a situation where, if the purported foreign next of kin turns out to the satisfaction of the court not to be the next of kin, the court could make the appropriate substitution. I think the member for Riverdale is quite right, as I understood his comments, that either one is a beneficiary or one is not a beneficiary, and he naturally expressed some interest in the basis on which a court would be satisfied that a person other than a foreign beneficiary would be entitled to the personal property.

I am grateful to him for bringing this to my attention, as well as these other issues that will be the subject matter of amendments. I thought it would be helpful if I just made these brief observations in opening with respect to the legislation being in committee of the whole House.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Chairman, we have a further change to subsection 19a(4). I assume the Attorney General is going to place that as well, or shall we proceed to deal with those amendments, since they are all within the first section of the bill? If they can be agreed to, perhaps we can handle all three seriatim.

Mr. Chairman: I think we should deal with one at a time.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, my colleague the member for Lake Nipigon (Mr. Stokes) asked me whether Latin was an accepted language under the rules of the House, and I assured him it was.

I do not have any problems with the amendments. Indeed, I appreciate the Attorney General responding to that concern of mine. My concern, strangely enough, was that somehow or other the concept that the member for Kitchener, with the best of intentions in the world, was trying to introduce—which I, with great respect, disagreed with—gave some latitude in the court to pick and choose who was going to get the money. I was a little bit worried about that. I think that was why the anomaly of the term "foreign beneficiary" appeared when I read the bill.

What I really wanted to have a brief exchange about in committee of the whole House was the vast difference between the very low-keyed statement the Attorney General has always made and the statements made by the member for Kitchener, not by way of exaggeration but in dimensions of the problem, and echoed by the member for High Park-Swansea (Mr. Shymko), about the number of dollars involved, the number of estates involved and the number of countries involved.

We get a compendium of information provided by the Attorney General that simply says, "Within the past few years, members of Toronto's Ukrainian community, particularly lawyers of Ukrainian ancestry, have brought to the attention of the Attorney General certain problems they have encountered in attempting to deal with the estates of persons dying in Ontario who leave beneficiaries in the Soviet Union."

I would like to know whether the rhetoric is correct: that it is also a problem with a number of countries lying behind the Iron Curtain. In so far as the information the Attorney General has is concerned, is it limited to the Soviet Union in relation to the encroachment on the value of legacies and bequests going to persons in the Soviet Union? Which countries does he intend to designate? Is it restricted to members of the Ukrainian community, or have there been a number of other cases?

I think the member for Kitchener referred to a lawyer having 400 files and said that the number of dollars was in the millions; the member for High Park-Swansea referred to it in the same rhetorical terms. What is the dimension of the problem we are dealing with? Is it the limited problem the Attorney General refers to related to the Soviet Union and to members of the Ukrainian community—I am not diminishing the seriousness of the problem—or is this a much broader problem related to a number of countries behind the Iron Curtain?

I would appreciate it if the Attorney General, who must have the information, could put it into some kind of perspective for us.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Chairman, it is a little difficult to measure the extent of the problem, because no one has been able to monitor the actual amount of money involved. It is believed to involve a large amount; the term "millions of dollars" is frequently mentioned.

I do not know of any system we could implement that would monitor the actual amount of money involved. Certainly it is a strongly held view that a number of these estates not only in the Soviet Union but in the Soviet-bloc countries are being, in the words of the legislation, "unduly depleted." The beneficiaries, whether they are named or those under an intestacy, often receive a small fraction of the amount of the bequest.

There is another issue that has caused some concern. It is an issue that is not directly dealt with in this legislation, because it is really an evidentiary matter. This is the concern that when some of the beneficiaries come forward as a result of an intestacy in the Soviet Union and other countries—Czechoslovakia, the Ukraine, Hungary, etc.—there is some doubt as to the legitimacy of these beneficiaries. To put it in very blunt terms, are they the people they purport to be? This is not dealt with in this legislation, but it does help to increase the level of concern with respect to this issue.

When it comes to measuring the extent of the problem, I am afraid I cannot be of much assistance other than to say that on a number of occasions I have met with lawyers of eastern European origin who have acted on a number of estates. They have provided me and my colleagues within the ministry with a fairly convincing case that there is a significant problem, but the actual extent of the problem is very difficult to measure.

9:30 p.m.

Again, we have made it clear to them that our legislative approach is not going to eliminate the problem. We hope it will help to persuade the officials in the countries involved that if they are going to be unreasonable with respect to the various costs that are applied, legal or otherwise, a court in Ontario may come to the conclusion that the estate has been unduly depleted and simply hold the money in trust, as opposed to any escheat to the crown, until it is satisfied that the estate has not been unduly depleted.

Obviously this criterion as to what is an undue depletion is a relatively general one and the courts will have to deal with each case on its own particular factual situation.

Mr. Renwick: I appreciate those comments as well because the question of some form of fraudulent impersonation of who is entitled to it is a problem every court must be alert to regardless of the origin. I can appreciate the problems might well be compounded and I thank the Attorney General for the clear statement that this bill does not deal with that problem in any way. I think I have some sense of it.

I do not want to pursue this too far. Is the Attorney General in a position to tell us now which countries he intends to designate by regulation? My clear understanding now is that this does not grant any extra jurisdiction to the courts. Is that correct? Their obligation is simply to find out who the beneficiary is and, having found out who the beneficiary is, in the one case, if they are satisfied that it will not be unduly depleted, to pay over the money; if they find out it will be something called "unduly depleted," to hold it or to require the personal representative to hold it. That is the way I read this bill.

The obvious question is how long do they hold it? What is the open-ended nature of this trust which is created? Is that something we leave for some other legislators in this assembly at the turn of the century? I will probably be the only one still here when that comes around.

I am not criticizing. I believe this is the correct way to do it, but I think the record should clearly show that these funds are held either by the court if it is money, or by the personal representative if it is personal property other than money, and they are held indefinitely for the person who is determined to be the beneficiary. It is a very open-ended requirement.

I do not know the answer, but I would simply ask the Attorney General to let me know whether my understanding is correct on those two points, that is, the designated countries and the indefinite nature of these trusts.

Is the purpose of subsections 6 and 7 in obtaining these reports which are to be prescribed by regulations simply for the purpose of trying to monitor what is happening and provide information? What other purpose do they serve?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I can answer most of this fairly briefly by saying that all the observations that have been made by the member for Riverdale reflect my understanding of the legis-

lation, with the exception of the designated countries about which he has asked me a specific question that was not dealt with directly. I expect the countries that will be designated—outside of the USSR—will be Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia and Lithuania. If there are any additional suggestions, we will consider them. But fundamentally those are the nations we expect to have designated.

On section 1:

Mr. Chairman: Hon. Mr. McMurtry moves that subsection 19a(4) of the act as set out in subsection 1(1) of the bill be amended by striking out “(2)” in the first line thereof and inserting in lieu thereof “(3).”

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: There is a further amendment to that same subsection.

Mr. Chairman: Is there? Let us deal with the first one.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Hon. Mr. McMurtry further moves that subsection 19a(4) of the act as set out in subsection 1(1) of the bill be amended by striking out the words “foreign beneficiary” in the second line and inserting in lieu thereof the words “person resident in a country designated by regulation under this section.”

Mr. Breithaupt: It is interesting to see that change. As I read it at least, the minister almost repeats the terms of his definition in subsection 19a(1) rather than leave the phrase “foreign beneficiary.” Is there some difference in not having the word “beneficiary” involved but instead the word “person”? Is there a reason for that? If there is, it has escaped me.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: The member for Riverdale drew this to my attention. He wondered under what circumstances the court would be satisfied that a person other than a foreign beneficiary would be entitled to the personal property. The court may by order direct its distribution to the person entitled.

When he raised that issue, in looking at it, what occurred to me was that either one is a foreign beneficiary or one is not a beneficiary. What the legislation appeared to be stating was that, notwithstanding the fact that one is in law a beneficiary under an estate, the court would still have the authority to designate somebody else to receive the property in one's stead. That, to me, was not the intention of the legislation.

The intention of that subsection was, where, during the course of the application it became clear that the person resident in the foreign

jurisdiction, the purported beneficiary, was not in fact the legal beneficiary, the court would have, in the course of the proceedings, the right simply to substitute, where it could be ascertained on an application. If there was an issue about this the court would have to direct a trial of the issue. The confusion I saw as a result of having this pointed out by the member for Riverdale was that either one is or is not a beneficiary in law.

I repeat that the purpose of this section was, where, during the course of the application it became clear that the purported foreign beneficiary was not the legal beneficiary, in other words, if the person on whose behalf the claim was made was not a legal beneficiary, the court on the proper evidence could substitute the “person entitled” in the words of that subsection.

Mr. Breithaupt: I suppose the minister could follow through on the theme that the law defines the term “beneficiary,” except that in this section there is a clear definition of the phrase “foreign beneficiary.” What he is doing in his amendment is replacing the term “foreign beneficiary” with what he has defined a foreign beneficiary to be. I am not quite certain why that is happening.

We see, and I have a note here, that if another person is entitled, then the foreign beneficiary—that is, the person upon whose account this application is being made—is not a beneficiary at all. Therefore the change is made to avoid using the word “beneficiary” at all in that subsection. That explanation makes somewhat more sense, but I presume that is because the counsel wrote it, and neither I nor the Attorney General attempted to define it.

9:40 p.m.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: The foreign beneficiary, as defined in 1981, means a beneficiary as opposed to a person who is resident. That is the distinction. After it was directed to my attention by the member for Riverdale, it seemed to me there was some confusion. I relied upon our expert draftsmen to remove that confusion.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Hon. Mr. McMurtry moves that subsection 19a(5) of the act as contained in subsection 1(1) of the bill be amended by striking out “(2)” in the first line and inserting in lieu thereof “(3).”

Motion agreed to.

Section 1, as amended, agreed to.

Sections 2 to 4, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill, as amended, ordered to be reported.

MOTOR VEHICLE DEALERS AMENDMENT ACT

Consideration of Bill 3, An Act to amend the Motor Vehicle Dealers Act.

Section 1 agreed to.

On section 2:

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Philip moves that section 2 of Bill 3 be amended by adding the following clause (s):

"Providing for the payment of claims by purchasers of a new motor vehicle to permit the replacement of such a vehicle which, before the first anniversary of its delivery to the purchaser, or before the vehicle has been driven 20,000 kilometres, has been the subject of four attempts to repair a defect by the manufacturer, the motor vehicle dealer or an agent thereof, has been out of service for an aggregate period of 30 days or more in the course of attempted repairs by the manufacturer, the motor vehicle dealer or an agent thereof, and whose defect remains substantially uncorrected."

Mr. Chairman: I am wondering, if it is all the same to the member for Etobicoke, if there is any discussion on clauses (o), (p), (q) or (r). No discussion? Carried.

The member for Etobicoke on his amendment.

Mr. Philip: Mr. Chairman, essentially this is a copy of Bill 20, which I introduced, known as the Lemon-Aid Act, or An Act to protect the Purchasers of New Motor Vehicles.

With the trend towards lower interest rates, there are some preliminary indications that with the upturn of new car sales we will once again face a proliferation of complaints by new car owners about the fact they have bought cars that are lemons, that have had large numbers of days in the repair shop for substantially the same faults and that the warranty is not working.

We know the difficulty of class action suits in this province, and in this country. My colleague the member for Welland-Thorold (Mr. Swart) has spoken on that topic on numerous occasions and indeed has introduced a private member's bill.

In the absence of such legislation it seems to us fairly clear that we need some protection for the consumer who happens to purchase a lemon. This is not an innovative idea on my part; in fact, it is a fairly close copy of the state of Connecticut's automobile warranty, or lemon law, which I have put into the Ontario statutes.

Those who have reviewed the literature on Connecticut and on two or three other states that have introduced similar legislation, know

that this does provide some protection to the consumer.

I have a thick file on one case alone, which I have sent to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Elgie), where a person who came to see me has shown that he has gone back time and again—over 25 times—for essentially the same complaint.

A couple of years ago I had the situation of a constituent who came to me with a car that was warped. The dealer could do nothing about it. Because of the way in which the frame was bent, he got an unwanted shower every time it rained. We never did resolve that problem.

When one called the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations they simply said: "All we can do is act as a mediator." Well, they act as a mediator and what invariably happens is that the dealer says it is not his problem, it is the company's problem, and the company says, "Go and see your dealer."

The Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations has indicated in a recent article in the Star that he would consider action in the way of protecting new car owners. I am facilitating that by moving an addition to this act of what essentially he and the Attorney General have expressed some interest in in my Bill 20. It will make it a lot easier if we pass this right at the moment rather than wait for my private member's bill to come up, at which time no doubt the government would rush to pass it.

Mr. Swart: It would steal it.

9:50 p.m.

Mr. Philip: I do not use the word "steal" because that is unparliamentary and the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry) and I have now resolved our differences on that bill. It has been taken care of.

I urge all members of the Liberal Party carefully to consider our proposal. We hope the Liberals will vote for it and we hope the government will similarly support the amendment.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Chairman, briefly, as the member for Etobicoke knows, he introduced this bill only a few minutes after I had informed him I had a similar bill ready on the very same day that I was going to introduce, and we discussed that. I believe it was also on that very same day I flew in from Ottawa with the member for Carleton (Mr. Mitchell) on board the same flight and I informed him I intended to introduce a bill regarding "lemon" automobiles, if that is a proper word to use.

There are a couple of things that particularly

concern me. One is the practice of automobile dealers repairing brand new cars and selling them without notifying the purchasers of such cars that those automobiles were damaged and subsequently repaired. As the member for Etobicoke clearly stated, the case of a bent chassis or undercarriage of an automobile is certainly an example of that.

Where an automobile may have been in a major accident in the process of transit from the manufacturing plant to the dealer, it would subsequently have been repaired by that same dealer under no obligation ever to report such damage to the new customer.

The dealer could repair that automobile using such products as putty, plastic and other kinds of body-filling material, and repaint it, never notifying the purchaser of the automobile and never breaking any law by doing so. Thus, the customer could be sold an automobile which would undoubtedly not last as long as one which had never been damaged, thereby causing on a long-term basis—maybe in some cases on a short-term basis—a very difficult situation for the owner of that automobile.

That only takes into account matters such as problems with the body of the automobile itself. Even more fundamental are issues such as truly mechanical problems, motor problems, transmission problems, drive train problems and so forth. The same situation occurs. Theoretically, a dealer could remove an automobile from the truck that delivers it, rev the engine and the engine could be defective; it could blow a piston or something like that. The dealer could repair that vehicle, never inform the customer and sell it as a new automobile because if it has not been previously owned it is still a new automobile.

A customer for such an automobile deserves to be afforded better protection. One of the methods of arriving at such protection, in the first year at least, is to have a bill such as Bill 20, proposed by the member for Etobicoke and also as proposed in this amendment which is similar if not exactly the same as Bill 20.

The owners of automobiles in other jurisdictions have such protection, as the member for Etobicoke has said. He has named the state of Connecticut. I believe California also has similar legislation. Massachusetts is contemplating or working on similar legislation right at this moment, as are several other jurisdictions in North America.

This amendment certainly warrants the support of each and every one of us, and it is our hope the member for Carleton, in his capacity

as parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations, will see the value of such legislation and the great benefit it could have for the consumers of this province. I know he is a very concerned person and, as one who wants to protect the consumers of this province, will undoubtedly be in favour of such a bill.

Mr. Martel: He got his marching orders.

Mr. Boudria: As the member for Sudbury East (Mr. Martel) has stated, he may have received orders to the contrary and been told not to support this very important amendment, but we as a party would like to support it. As I said earlier, we had a very similar bill that I had myself proposed. It is our hope that the government is revealing a new philosophy that it has undoubtedly had since the recent trust companies incident, that it now has to take an active interest in the protection of consumers. We all know it will endeavour to do this.

Perhaps the member for Carleton will say that such a bill will be more effective if it was at the federal level. Undoubtedly that point will come up because it has been said in the past by others. Although we agree that other legislatures could do their share as well for the protection of consumers, I believe that certainly it is our duty and incumbent upon us as legislators to support this amendment to help the consumers of Ontario in purchasing new automobiles, either domestic or imported.

Mr. Swart: Mr. Chairman, when Bill 3 was before us there was unanimous support for the principle of this bill which gave some additional protection to purchasers of new vehicles against default on the part of the dealer. I would rather hope that this same sense of political ecumenism would apply to this amendment which has been put forward by my colleague from Etobicoke. It certainly adds to the bill; it provides a very needed additional measure of protection to purchasers of automobiles.

Of course I have an interest in it apart from the fact that I have had some part in consumer matters. Since I have been a member I can recall offhand at least three or four occasions when people had bought new cars which were lemons and they could not get the problems corrected. That had a substantial adverse effect on them, not only financially but psychologically.

One person had bought a car that turned out to be one of the purest lemons ever purchased by a consumer. It was a foreign car and that is another reason there is need for this legislation.

In our Canadian-made and American-made cars, we do have some avenues of appeal—not a certain measure of getting redress—directly to the manufacturers. When one gets into the purchase of a foreign car, one cannot follow that same route to the top. Therefore, it is more difficult—

Mr. Boudria: It is a little hard for the people with Ladas, for instance.

Mr. Swart: Particularly the people with Ladas, but even the Japanese cars; with all of the foreign makes it is much more difficult to get redress. Therefore this kind of bill becomes more essential.

The woman I referred to had bought this foreign made car from a dealer in the St. Catharines area and found it totally unsatisfactory. It was breaking down all of the time. She took it back and never did get satisfaction. Eventually, she wrote a book about it, which was published. I want to tell members that it had a long-term effect on her psychologically.

10 p.m.

On another occasion, a purchaser paid a substantial amount for a truck. After he purchased this truck, he found out the chassis had been altered from the specifications of the truck he thought he had purchased. I guess it was a special order that had been made. He had trouble with the transmission and with the drive shaft, and that continued. He lost literally thousands and thousands of dollars on that truck.

I suspect that if we had had this kind of legislation—and it may have had to be broadened somewhat—that it could have dealt with the issue of the Chevmobile. People bought Oldsmobiles thinking they were getting a car with an Oldsmobile engine and later found out it had only a Chevrolet engine in it.

The Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations at the time, the member for Scarborough Centre (Mr. Drea), blustered about that and said he would make these companies come to heel. He would not settle for the \$200, as they had done in lots of other jurisdictions. The end result was the people got nothing. They were out entirely the difference in value between that Oldsmobile motor and the Chev motor.

More recently, there has been—and I have had some occasion to bring this to the attention of the current Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Elgie)—trouble with a light transmission being put in some cars. I have forgotten what make it was right now, but

inadequate and light transmissions have been put in a cars which, by all specifications, should have had heavier transmissions.

As I say, it may be the legislation would have to be broadened to deal with all of these particular problems. The amendment by my colleague the member for Etobicoke might not quite cover all of these, but I suggest to the parliamentary assistant that even if it does not, it is a good start.

Although the member has intimated—and I take his word for it and perhaps he is going to make a further commitment when he gets on his feet—that there is in the works some consumer protection legislation with regard to lemons and these other problems, I would suggest the best way to prove good faith that they are going to bring this in is to accept this amendment at the present time.

If they bring in a bill to further amend the present Motor Vehicle Dealers Act to incorporate more consumer protection measures, they can always amend and delete this amendment by my colleague the member for Etobicoke. But if we accept it at this time—because this is a measure that is needed certainly as much as any other—then it does show a degree of good faith. On that basis, I would ask the parliamentary assistant to consider support of this amendment and to incorporate it in the legislation we have before us.

During the years I have been in this Legislature, we have had a great many commitments made on that side of the House about legislation they intended to table in order to correct problems. Time after time we have had both opposition parties move amendments to legislation brought before this House to incorporate those further provisions. The government has always seemed to turn them down on the excuse, "We are going to bring in more comprehensive legislation and, therefore, we do not want to touch this at the present time."

In many instances, I do not doubt the good intentions of the members of the government in doing this, but in practice the majority of those amendments have never been brought to this Legislature for a variety of reasons. Whether there is no time to deal with them, whether there have been changes in the ministries, or whether the ministers themselves have moved from one ministry to another, they have not come before this House. Therefore, more and more, regardless of good intentions, I am inclined to feel we must use every opportunity when we have amending legislation brought in by the govern-

ment to tag on our amendments that we think will improve the situation.

I think this is one amendment that even the government would feel there could be no harm in passing, that it would only improve the situation as it wants to improve it. Although it may not be as comprehensive as it would hope it could be by bringing in its own legislation in the future, it would certainly show good faith on its part. The big thing is we would have it in place now.

I am sure the Liberal Party is going to support this amendment. If we could now have concurrence from the government side of the House tonight, we could make this improvement people have been waiting for for years.

In conclusion, I say to the parliamentary assistant, who talked to me about this privately, perhaps he can rise up now and say, "Yes, we are going to bring in legislation on our own, but because this is part of any legislation we bring in we will support it right now."

Mr. J. M. Johnson: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to disappoint the member for Welland-Thorold, but the member for Carleton (Mr. Mitchell) is not going to rise up now in answer to his question because I want to make a few comments. Those members seem to feel they have the right to speak whenever they want, but I think some of the government members should have the right to express themselves.

Interjections.

Mr. J. M. Johnson: All right; calm down. I would like to go on record as saying I fully support the concept of the motor vehicle dealers compensation fund, but I have a bit of a problem with it. Perhaps it can be resolved with the ministry.

Mr. Martel: We hope you will support the bill then.

Mr. Charlton: It's your amendment.

Mr. J. M. Johnson: Just cool it. My father was in the car business all his life, 40 some years. I think I know a little bit about car sales and the background to that. I have 25 to 30 dealers in my riding. They are small dealers selling 20, 30 or 40 cars in a year.

I find a discrepancy in Addison on Bay Ltd. paying \$150 a year and my small, individual dealers are supposed to pay the same amount to create a fund of \$1 million. I think it should be related more to the policy in the travel business where the fee is based on volume.

Mr. Swart: Turn around and talk to the guy behind you.

Interjections.

Mr. J. M. Johnson: I do not see anything in here about lemons. I thought the member was talking about lemons.

I will be brief. The parliamentary assistant is getting quite agitated. He wants me to quiet down so I will only take a couple of minutes. All I am saying is I understand that when this bill is brought in there will be consultation with the car dealers. I hope they will take into consideration the fact that there should be some equity in the charges levied against the dealers based on the volume of the franchise. I hope that is reasonable. It does not seem to me to be out of the way. I would hope the members across the floor could support that type of proposition.

10:10 p.m.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Chairman, while I chat my colleague is drafting an amendment that I might be prepared to move which would incorporate that very idea being presented, unless the parliamentary assistant is prepared to do it. I would take my place if he is prepared to move that amendment.

I am sure those of us on this side of the House are all prepared to accept an amendment that would protect the small dealers. I understand what my colleague says. If the parliamentary assistant wants to move the amendment so that it does not come from the opposition, I am prepared to take my place. If he is not, then I—

Mr. Mitchell: There is no fee structure, in fact.

Mr. Martel: Let me make two points as a member who once had a lemon and over a two and half year period had 14 sets of brake shoes put on that car. When I finally got rid of it, it was still not working. I remember driving down Highway 400 going home one weekend in July and it let go in the middle of a holiday weekend. I was in the middle lane and the brakes let go again. I had 14 sets of brake shoes put on that one car. It was frightening.

They could not get to the basis of the problem nor would they take the car back. I was stuck with a car on which the brakes went on 14 different occasions, and there was no recourse for me. My dealer tried everything under the sun to find out what was wrong. He brought in the experts but they could not find it; yet there was no way they would replace it.

There I was out on the highway driving a car which was a hazard to me, my family and every

other person who came remotely close to my vehicle. It was an eerie experience. I was absolutely delighted, in one sense, to get rid of it, but I knew that some other poor fish was going to have that car; and I had bought it new.

Mr. Treleven: Why did the member not junk it?

Mr. Martel: Unlike some of those legal people, those of us in the Legislature in those days could not afford it. Not being in the cabinet, I did not have a chauffeur-driven limousine like my friend the government House leader, so I had to put up with this ruddy car which was a hazard to everyone on the highway.

Let me make my second point. I totally agree with my friend the member for Wellington-Dufferin-Peel (Mr. J. M. Johnson) that it would be unfair to charge everyone the same amount.

Has he got that written out? I will move it.

Mr. Chairman: We have an amendment to the amendment?

Mr. Martel: Yes. Does the member for Wellington-Dufferin-Peel want to second this? Where is he? He is a man of integrity and principle, and I know he would want to second this motion. Therefore, I move that clause 2(b) of the bill be amended by adding the following after the word thereof, "proportional to their sales."

Mr. Chairman: We have already passed clause (p).

Mr. Martel: No, no.

Mr. Chairman: Yes, we have already passed clause (p).

Mr. Martel: It is clause (b) of section 2 of the bill.

Mr. Chairman: I do not see a (b).

Mr. Martel: Pardon me, (p). The writing is so bad. I would fail him in school. He could never get a grade with me.

Mr. Chairman: I see clauses (o), (p), (q), (r). We are dealing with clause (s) in a proposed amendment. Where does this come in? We have passed (p).

Mr. Martel: That section 2 of the bill be amended.

Mr. Chairman: It is out of order.

Mr. Swart: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. If we get unanimous consent of the House, we could revert to that section after we deal with the section we are on at the present time.

Mr. Chairman: We will need unanimous consent because we did pass clause (p).

Mr. Swart: I am sure the members on that side would not cross up their own member.

Mr. Chairman: Let us get going with the other amendment, clause (s). One amendment at a time. Let us get this show going.

Mr. Mitchell: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I can address the whole question of fees in my wrap-up. There are no fees set as yet; there have been fees talked about in a specific area with the industry, but the regulation is yet to be drawn. The fees have not been finalized; in fact, there will be further meetings with the associations representing the dealers before the fees are struck.

They have talked in the area of \$150 on a two-year basis because they are currently paying \$75 to \$100 for a bond. Once the fund reaches \$1 million, they will get a holiday. Nothing has been finalized and that is quite clear. There will be a meeting with the industry prior to the regulations being formulated.

Mr. Chairman: Speaking to the proposed amendment from the member for Etobicoke on clause (s).

Mr. Martel: Is it the government's intention to deal with what my friend the member for Wellington-Dufferin-Peel is proposing? Is it the government's intention to bring in an amount based on sales or volume? It will not simply be one levy across the board, is that right?

Mr. Mitchell: All I can say is that it is something to be considered. The industry will have to be met with after the passage of this bill. They support this bill. The fees have not been established as a final figure.

Mr. Philip: I would like some clarification. We were dealing with an amendment to section 2 of the bill. That amendment was a new section, clause (s). But we have not passed section 2 as amended and therefore it is in order to—

Mr. Chairman: Make it clause (t) then. We have already passed clauses (o), (p), (q) and (r) and we are dealing with clause (s). Make your second amendment as clause (t).

Mr. Philip: We have not passed section 2 as amended.

Mr. Chairman: That is right. I agree with that.

Mr. Philip: Therefore it is surely possible to amend clause (p).

Mr. Chairman: No, I am going to rule that out of order. We passed that; everyone was present at the time. I said, "Since your proposed amendment is clause (s), can we deal with clauses (o),

(p), (q) and (r)?" Everyone agreed. They are all passed.

Mr. Philip: Since this is obviously our attempt to accommodate a Conservative member, I am sure we could get unanimous consent.

Mr. Chairman: All right. Do we have unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: No.

Mr. Martel: If we were to follow what the member is saying, we could simply make that clause (s).

Mr. Chairman: No, clause (t). We have an amendment for clause (s) already. Let us deal with (s). One amendment is on the floor already, from the member for Etobicoke.

Mr. Martel: Would you read that for me, Mr. Chairman? I want to hear the amendment.

Mr. Chairman: "Providing for the payment of claims by purchasers of a new motor vehicle to permit the replacement of such a vehicle which, before the first anniversary of its delivery to the purchaser, or before the vehicle has been driven 20,000 kilometres, has been the subject of four attempts to repair a defect by the manufacturer, the motor vehicle dealer or an agent thereof, has been out of service for an aggregate period of 30 days or more, in the course of attempted repairs by the manufacturer, the motor vehicle dealer or an agent thereof, and whose defect remains substantially uncorrected."

That is the proposed amendment by the member for Etobicoke to be added as clause 2(s) to Bill 3, An Act to amend the Motor Vehicle Dealers Act.

10:20 p.m.

Mr. Martel: I would ask for clarification: why is it not possible to add to an amendment that is at present before you?

Mr. Chairman: Fine. Do you want to amend the amendment?

Mr. Martel: Yes, that would be the simplest way. Could we add those words then. Is that fine with you?

Mr. Chairman: That is fine with me.

Mr. Martel: I can then say, Mr. Chairman, that clause 2(s) be further amended to add the words "proportional to their sales." Is that quite acceptable to the Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: Do you have only one copy? I should have written it down. What does it say? Read it nice and clear so everyone can hear.

Mr. Martel: An amendment to that amend-

ment by simply adding the words "proportional to their sales."

Mr. Nixon: Will the member get his act together over there?

Mr. Martel: I am doing this on behalf of the member for Wellington-Dufferin-Peel. I am simply trying to incorporate what he wants in the bill.

Mr. Chairman: Okay, thank you. "Proportional to their sales." I am obliged to follow through with the standing orders. I would like to put the amendment.

Mr. Philip: I have an amendment to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman: We can only have one amendment to the amendment. I would like to ask one question. Are we going to continue with this or can we put the vote?

We have all heard the amendment. Is it the pleasure of the House that the amendment carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion the nays have it.

Motion negatived.

Is section 2 carried?

Mr. Philip: I have a new amendment.

Mr. Chairman: Well, I will have to call you out of order.

Under the standing orders we have to go to the vote.

Mr. Nixon: We'll finish the bill another day.

Mr. Chairman: Call in the members.

10:32 p.m.

LANDLORD AND TENANT AMENDMENT ACT

(concluded)

The committee divided on Mr. Philip's amendment to section 1, which was negatived on the following vote:

Ayes 28; nays 39.

Section 1 agreed to.

The committee divided on Mr. Philip's amendment to section 2, which was negatived on the same vote.

Section 2 agreed to.

Section 5 agreed to.

Bill ordered to be reported.

On motion by Hon. Mr. Wells, the committee of the whole House reported one bill with certain amendments, two bills without amendment and progress on one bill.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10:36 p.m.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, May 17, 1983

Second reading

Estates Administration Amendment Act , Bill 29, Mr. McMurtry, Mr. Renwick, Mr. Shymko, Mr. Kolyn, Mr. G. I. Miller, agreed to.	843
---	-----

Committee of the whole House

Landlord and Tenant Amendment Act , Bill 32, Mr. McMurtry, Mr. Philip, stood down . . .	847
Small Claims Courts Amendment Act , Bill 28, Mr. McMurtry, Mr. Renwick, reported . . .	849
Estates Administration Amendment Act , Bill 29, Mr. McMurtry, Mr. Breithaupt, Mr. Renwick, reported.	853
Motor Vehicle Dealers Amendment Act , Bill 3, Mr. Elgie, Mr. Philip, Mr. Boudria, Mr. Swart, Mr. J. M. Johnson, Mr. Martel, Mr. Mitchell, reported.	857
Landlord and Tenant Amendment Act , Bill 32, Mr. McMurtry, reported.	862

Other business

Adjournment	862
------------------------------	-----

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Boudria, D. (Prescott-Russell L)
 Breithaupt, J. R. (Kitchener L)
 Cureatz, S. L., Deputy Speaker and Chairman (Durham East PC)
 Johnson, J. M. (Wellington-Dufferin-Peel PC)
 Kolyn, A. (Lakeshore PC)
 Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
 McMurtry, Hon. R. R., Attorney General (Eglinton PC)
 Miller, G. I. (Haldimand-Norfolk L)
 Mitchell, R. C. (Carleton PC)
 Philip, E. T. (Etobicoke NDP)
 Renwick, J. A. (Riverdale NDP)
 Shymko, Y. R. (High Park-Swansea PC)
 Swart, M. L. (Welland-Thorold NDP)
 Treleaven, R. L. (Oxford PC)



Hansard

Official Report of Debates

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Third Session, 32nd Parliament

Thursday, May 19, 1983

Afternoon Sitting

Speaker: Honourable John M. Turner

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

Contents of the proceedings reported in this issue of Hansard appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of the speakers taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is \$15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, Information Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 965-2238.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Thursday, May 19, 1983

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

RESPONSE TO WRITTEN QUESTIONS

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, I rise on what I consider to be an important point of privilege. It deals with what I consider to be a breach of the standing order dealing with written questions, standing order 81.

Back in September 1982 questions 264 to 268 were put on the order paper requiring an answer from the Office of the Premier. Standing order 81(d) gives the government or the minister in question 14 days to make some sort of response to these questions.

As it turned out, we did not get a response until October 29, 1982. At that time it was said with regard to questions 264 to 268, which were the questions I put on—and I read from the interim answers—"Every effort will be made to answer the following questions on or before December 17, 1982." December 17, 1982, went by, of course, and at the end of the session in February 1983 the questions were still not answered.

The questions were put on the order paper again on April 22, 1983, and this week a response was obtained from the Premier's office. Let me read that response, Mr. Speaker. They were very innocuous questions, simply asking which Conservative candidates since 1971 are basically on the government payroll.

The answer read, "Since the names of all appointees are already a matter of public record, the expenditure of time and effort required to provide the information in question would not be commensurate with the benefits to be derived thereby." That was the response we were given, Mr. Speaker, and you can understand our frustration.

I went back to research, knowing I would get your admonition if I was not right on the question of law and precedent in this House. I researched the point completely.

As you have told us on many occasions, you have no power to force the Premier (Mr. Davis) or any other minister to respond to a question. In addition, the standing order does provide, and there is precedent for it, that the Premier

can refuse to answer a question. But I think what you can do, and I believe this is important to all members in this assembly, is ensure at least that the ministers on that side follow the standing orders, so that we are not put off and put off again, as we have been since September 1982.

Finally, I get the answer that the time and effort are not worth the answer. I think that is pretty cynical, and an abuse of standing order 81.

Just because an answer may be politically embarrassing to the government is not a reason to refuse to give the answer. Try as we may—and you can understand, Mr. Speaker, we are trying to follow all these appointments—it is very difficult for us on this side to follow which appointment was made when and at what remuneration. There should be some directive to the ministers on that side, and to the Premier's office, that they do not abuse standing order 81.

Mr. Speaker: I have listened intently and I am sure the member would agree that, interesting as his statement is, it is hardly a point of privilege. However, I think the point was well made. The standing orders are for the guidance and direction of all members, and I am sure the member to whom the question was addressed will take note of your remarks.

ESTIMATES

Hon. Mr. McCague: Mr. Speaker, I have a message from the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor signed by his own hand.

Mr. Speaker: The Lieutenant Governor transmits estimates of certain sums required for the services of the province for the year ending March 31, 1984, and recommends them to the Legislative Assembly. Signed in his own hand, Toronto, May 19, 1983.

STATEMENT BY THE MINISTRY

DEVELOPMENTALLY HANDICAPPED PEOPLE

Hon. Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, as I notified the House last October, the Bluewater Centre in Goderich is the second of six institutions for the developmentally handicapped that my ministry intends to close by the spring of 1986. This

consolidation of institutional services is part of a five-year plan for expanding community living opportunities for the developmentally handicapped residents of this province. Of the \$33.7 million in 1982 dollars we will spend on this program, \$23.7 million will come from the closure of these six facilities.

Closing the St. Lawrence Regional Centre in Brockville was the first phase. As I reported to the House on April 28, the plans for that closure are complete and we are extremely pleased with what has been accomplished. When the centre closes in June, 74 of its 100 former residents will be living in group homes and family homes in the community. Another six residents will be ready to move back to the community within two to three years, after they receive the additional training they require.

Fifty of the 77 civil servants at the St. Lawrence Regional Centre have accepted new positions with my ministry and another seven are negotiating for positions with the Ministry of Health at the Brockville Psychiatric Hospital. I have already provided this House with the details of these staff transfers.

2:10 p.m.

I assured the parents of residents at the Bluewater Centre that we would not proceed to the second phase of our plan until I was satisfied with the progress in Brockville. I told the House last month that I was more than satisfied with what we had achieved there and that we would be developing closure plans for Bluewater in the near future. The program to close Bluewater began Monday.

My staff met with the parents of residents at Bluewater Centre during March in Owen Sound, Clinton, Stratford and Walkerton to discuss the five-year plan and explain the alternatives that will be available. Following these meetings, relatives had an opportunity to discuss individually their placement preferences for their sons and daughters with the Bluewater administrator and program director.

These individual meetings will continue until all relatives have had an opportunity to discuss their preferences with the staff at the centre. The members can be assured no final decisions will be made until full consultation has taken place on this individual basis.

I am pleased to report that almost all the residents who will require continuing institutional care will be moved to Palmerston, which is in the same catchment area as Bluewater, and most of those residents going to community

settings will also be relocated in the same general area, near their relatives and friends. In the case of residents whose families live outside the Goderich area, every effort will be made to relocate them near their home communities.

My staff has also been sensitive to the fact that the residents have made friends at the centre over the years. Special care will be taken to move residents who require continuing institutional care to the same facility as their friends.

Letters were sent last Monday from my ministry to the parents and guardians of these residents, reporting on the successes we have achieved to date in the implementation of our five-year plan and informing them of our program to close Bluewater.

We also notified the staff and union at Bluewater Centre last Monday of our closure plans and gave them surplus notices effective November 18, 1983. We conducted the announcement as follows: We notified, first, the union head office; then we notified the management supervisors and union executive at the centre; finally, we ensured this information was communicated to the staff by having the director of human resources for my ministry and several regional officers at the centre on Monday to speak to the employees at every shift change.

Instead of the 90-day notice of a closure required by our collective agreement with the union, we are giving all employees a full six months' notice. We will also conduct personal interviews with each staff member and consult with them concerning their rights under the collective agreement. Finally, we are offering a range of supports for employees who are prepared to relocate, should that be necessary. These will, of course, include arrangements for job interviews and relocation expenses.

Once again I stress that no resident of any institution for the developmentally handicapped will move to the community without a properly supervised residential setting and, where applicable, a work, training or activity program. Every civil servant in the six institutions to be closed will be given preference for jobs in our remaining 11 facilities or in other areas within the public service where they may qualify.

As I have said many times in the past, we believe our program of providing community alternatives to institutional living for developmentally handicapped people, which began in 1975, will enrich the lives of thousands of residents of this province in the years to come.

ORAL QUESTIONS

AUTOMOTIVE PARTS INDUSTRY

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Industry and Trade if, for a moment, he can take his mind off the great questions of war and peace, or whether he will build a war machine in this province.

I would like to ask him an important question with respect to his response to the automotive task force report which has been made public today. I know the minister has seen it and I am sure he has a response. What is his response, and is he prepared to use his good offices to try to persuade the federal government and other parties that this report is taking the right approach?

Hon. Mr. Walker: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Speaker, in the task force report it is noted that the Ontario Centre for Automotive Parts Technology is simply not good enough. What is needed is significant help in identifying and exploiting opportunities for greater manufacturing of Canadian auto parts. This is an area where the Ontario government can make a direct contribution.

Can the minister point to any specific successes of his ministry, either domestically or through foreign offices, in identifying potential markets for Ontario auto parts producers, and can he tell us the concrete steps he is taking to enable Ontario parts producers to cash in on the opportunities in the future?

Hon. Mr. Walker: Mr. Speaker, one of the great benefits of the automotive parts technology centre is the fact that it will allow the 900 auto parts firms in Ontario an opportunity to get on the leading edge of technological innovation. Certainly, 50 of those 900 have in-house research and development capabilities, but the remaining 850 firms do not have that capacity. The technology centre in St. Catharines will provide those 800-odd firms with an opportunity to plug into the system and get the latest possible research and the latest possible access to technology.

By so doing, they will become competitive. Although there is a fairly competitive market now in auto parts, when the manufacturers are more competitive they will have the opportunity to ply the world with their auto parts and to continue selling their products already positioned in the international marketplace.

For instance, Trident makes the plastic windshield wiper; I do not think there is a car in Japan that is produced without the Trident windshield wiper on it. That is a company

located here in Ontario servicing the Japanese market. We have other firms servicing the West German market and others, again, servicing Britain and other parts of our Commonwealth; so there are some areas we can point to where successes have occurred.

The auto parts technology centre we have established is only a beginning in the process. Ultimately, private enterprise will be able to fulfil its needs in this area and will follow the recommendations and suggestions put forward in the very good task force report, which I think will receive some support from Ottawa. I met with Mr. Lumley, the minister, on Tuesday afternoon, and I was satisfied that he had some knowledge of it and was quite happy with the direction it had taken.

Mr. Cooke: Mr. Speaker, the minister will know that if content legislation is introduced at the federal level, there will be a need to expand the Canadian auto parts firms in Ontario. Those firms will also need capital to increase their capacity, their productivity and so forth. Is this government prepared to introduce legislation or develop a vehicle whereby it can co-invest with the private sector to infuse capital into the auto parts industry, so that it can meet the demand that will result from content legislation—content legislation that this party has been pushing for many years?

Hon. Mr. Walker: Mr. Speaker, that vehicle already exists in the Ontario Development Corp., in the technology centres capability, in the Innovation Development for Employment Advancement Corp. and in a variety of other programs that exist. It will be there to meet the needs, the member for Windsor-Riverside can rest assured of that.

Mr. Wrye: Mr. Speaker, undoubtedly one of the important aspects of moving forward with this report and having offshore auto companies manufacturing in Canada would be the research and development aspect. Can the minister tell us what steps he has taken in discussions he may have had with offshore auto companies, or is prepared to take in the time to come, to ensure that the manufacturing aspect, as they move into Canada and into Ontario, includes the research and development factor which is so important to us? What steps is the minister prepared to urge and encourage them to take?

Hon. Mr. Walker: Mr. Speaker, it has to be recognized that the automotive industry is a blended industry, blended between the two countries of North America. That industry basically makes use of the automobile produc-

tion technology that exists in the United States. Basically, we have assembly plants here in Ontario and in Canada. The assembly plants obviously assemble parts, and if I can use the saying, the whole is the sum of its parts.

We have the capacity for research and development as it relates to parts. We have the auto parts technology centre, which will be a very viable vehicle to bring that about. As well, we have the advantage of the R and D capabilities of the Big Three or the Big Four, but particularly the Big Three in the United States, because the moment something is developed there, it is transferred almost instantaneously into the Canadian market. So technology transfer does in fact occur there.

We will want to see more encouragement of it. Indeed, with the last arrangement with Chrysler two or three years ago my predecessor took steps that would have seen the establishment of an R and D facility. They chose not to pursue that particular course. It was up to them to draw down the moneys; they chose not to do it.

However, there have been some attempts made in the past and there will be attempts made in the future to coalesce here in Ontario more research and development capabilities for the auto makers we have here, regardless of where that auto-making firm might come from.

2:20 p.m.

INDIAN BAND AGREEMENT

Mr. Van Horne: Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development concerning his statement on Tuesday regarding the government's revised mercury pollution agreement with the Islington band, a matter that still remains unresolved after five years of negotiations.

The provincial secretary's letter to Chief Isaac Mandamin of the Islington band states that changes in the revised agreement have only "improved the clarity and accuracy of the agreement but have not altered the major thrust of the agreement." How can the minister reconcile these comments with the two major changes he has in fact made to the February draft agreement which the band had signed?

The first is that instead of outright ownership by the band of a \$1-million greenhouse complex, it is now to lease the land and the complex, and they can be retrieved by the government after 10 years. The second is that whereas the band was to receive an open licence to harvest wild rice in the new reserve lands to be created under the Hydro agreement, the revised version

allows the government to change the licence unilaterally.

Is the minister aware that the band does consider these to be major differences, that there is a major difference between a \$1-million grant and a demand loan, and would he not agree that this revised document is merely for publicity purposes and that he has no serious intention of ever arriving at an agreement settlement?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member should have been around when the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Pope) and I were doing the negotiating with the band chief and his advisers.

Mr. Van Horne: I missed your invitation.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: If he had been, he would fully understand what is said here. One, there never was a time, not even for half a minute, when it was agreed that the greenhouse would go on band land. It was the understanding in the agreement from day one that the greenhouse would be built off the reserve on crown land. So there is no change there whatsoever just a clarification.

It was agreed that the native people would have the opportunity to grow wild rice in the lakes in a defined area, not in the overall defined area—in the lakes in the defined area, the area covered by water. The change made in the agreement was to say it would be the area covered by water in that defined area. There is not one bit of change.

The Minister of Natural Resources and I were both there for all of these negotiations. I believe I have answered the member's question. If he has further questions, I will be happy to answer.

Mr. J. A. Reed: Mr. Speaker, surely the minister would agree that a change from ownership to a lease renewable every 10 years is a major change in the document. Does he not agree the Islington band considered the agreement it signed to be a final agreement, subject to perhaps a few minor changes in wording?

Does the minister not agree these changes now leave the band with no alternative but to take legal action? It has advised us, and our information this morning is that it has now abandoned all out-of-court discussion with the government. How can the minister reconcile his government's inaction on this matter with reflection on Mr. Justice Hartt's words when he said, "What justification for immediate government

action is required here other than common decency and restoration of human dignity?"

For heaven's sake, when is the minister going to act? This has been going on for years.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Mr. Speaker, again I must repeat that the honourable member apparently does not understand the agreement or any of the negotiations leading up to the agreement. There never was any agreement—

Mr. J. A. Reed: Chief Mandamin understood what he signed. You changed it.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Henderson:—verbally or in writing, that they would own the land where the greenhouse was to be. There was the agreement that we would build the greenhouse off reserve, and all the wording does is to define the area where the greenhouse will be built.

I believe I have answered his question; I am not sure.

Mr. Wildman: Mr. Speaker, I have both documents, the February draft signed by the band and the draft that the minister referred to on Tuesday.

Is it not the case that in the February draft it stated, "Ontario agrees to transfer ownership of the land and buildings to the government of Canada to be held in trust for the band," and that the draft he mentioned on Tuesday states, "Ontario agrees to lease the land for 10 years and to transfer ownership of the buildings" and then further goes on to say that those buildings could revert in ownership to the provincial government if the agreement with the Ministry of Natural Resources is not completed?

How can the minister claim this is simply a clarification? The minister has clarified \$1 million out of this agreement. He has done more negotiations with Ben Ratuski than he has with Chief Mandamin. When is he going to try to stop hoodwinking the public of this province and come clean and have a settlement that will finally bring this thing to an end?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: I would like to read that particular paragraph, if I may. A few words were taken from it.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Mr. Speaker, I am in your jurisdiction. The agreement is 20 pages long. If members really want a full understanding, I should present the agreement; but again, on second thought I will present this four-page explanation of it.

I will start off by presenting just one para-

graph to answer this honourable member, but if you feel it needs more clarification, Mr. Speaker, I will present the four pages and then the agreement, if that is your wish.

"Article 2: Economic development; the greenhouse," page 4.

"The May agreement has an additional subsection regarding the leasing of the land, and the renewal of the lease upon which the greenhouse will be built and the conditions of ownership of the greenhouse by the federal government in trust for the band. These matters were not addressed in our agreement in principle, and in less detail in the February draft agreement."

So all we have done, again, is to clarify the wording of the agreement.

Mr. Van Horne: On a point of clarification: It is our understanding that the February agreement in so far as wild rice is concerned indicates that this change would be made only through consent with the bands. But the new agreement says "with advice," which means they may advise not to do it and still the government could go ahead unilaterally and change it. That is a significant change. How does the minister explain it?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Again I would love to take the time, but in order that the honourable member can understand it I will read this. Maybe the opposition cannot understand it, but I think you can, Mr. Speaker.

"Wild rice," pages 9 and 10. It covers two pages in the agreement.

"In order to implement the commitment contemplated in the agreement in principle in the February draft agreement with respect to the 21-year licence to harvest wild rice and a special licence to harvest rice in the bay of Swan Lake, the May agreement stipulates the minister will recommend required changes to the Wild Rice Harvesting Act. In the May agreement 'reasonable use' in the wild rice section has been clarified to read 'reasonable harvesting of wild rice.'"

If those members over there understood the harvesting of wild rice, they would understand that.

2:30 p.m.

ACID RAIN

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Norton), I would like to address my question to the Premier. In July 1982, at the time Ontario Hydro announced it was shelving its proposals for the

installation of two scrubbers, probably at the Lambton generating station, the Minister of the Environment was quoted as saying on that day, "We will be looking at their existing order with the view of tightening it up further."

In the light of the tremendous importance Ontario's own efforts in controlling acid rain have in getting the United States Congress and the American authorities to move to reduce emissions in the United States, can he tell us what steps his government is taking to ensure Ontario Hydro will install these scrubbers and speed up its reduction of SO₂ emissions in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the honourable member in his visitation to Washington yesterday and his, I am sure, rather detailed discussions with some members of the Congress and other people in the American government in relation to this problem, really made a genuine attempt to explain to our American neighbours that, while we have certain problems in this province with respect to emissions, on a total assessment there still are far more significant problems south of the border. I am sure he conveyed that to them in the very polite and subtle way he would do so. I hope he had some measure of success in explaining this.

The minister will be delighted to give him an update with respect to the control orders. I think he can assure the member that, in terms of the progress being made with respect to Ontario Hydro and Inco, we do not take second place to what is happening in the Ohio Valley or in some other areas of our great neighbour to the south.

I really appreciate the fact the leader of the New Democratic Party went to Washington on his way back from Dallas and returned here knowing full well that, in spite of the many problems he confronts this government with, he really did not want to stay in Texas or in the District of Columbia; he wanted to return here to the province of opportunity, although the opportunity does not extend, shall we say, to his political future.

Mr. Rae: I appreciate the Premier's warm wishes of welcome home. The fact the government of Ontario's publicly owned utility decided last year not to install two scrubbers has caused a problem, not for those in the United States who are opposed to moving on acid rain, but for those in the United States who are in favour of moving on acid rain, because they perceive there to be a major credibility problem with

respect to what the government of Ontario is doing as opposed to what it is saying.

If he is really interested in seeing progress is achieved in the United States with respect to reducing emissions, the overwhelming consensus of the people I spoke to in Washington over the last two days—US government people, Canadian government people and other officials—was if Ontario could take greater unilateral action, that would do more to strengthen the hand of those who want to move on acid rain than almost anything else Canada could do.

Does the Premier not see the value, in reaching an agreement, of our publicly owned utility taking a leadership role rather than having to be dragged kicking and screaming into the 20th century with respect to pollution control?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I do not purport to be as knowledgeable on this subject as the honourable member, but I have been involved with this subject for a period of time. I too have had the odd discussion with some of our neighbours, including the governors of the surrounding states and some of the Environmental Protection Agency people on that delightful island of Mackinac, I guess it was last June.

I fully appreciate the view of some of our American neighbours that if Ontario would do more—without recognizing how far we have come, which is always the problem—it would be easier for those in support of the reduction of emissions in the United States to make some progress. I do not quarrel with that. What concerns me is that we have made substantial reductions and we have not seen quite the same enthusiasm in terms of commitments in the United States. I think the member must acknowledge that. I say in a very constructive fashion to our American neighbours that we have made far more progress on a percentage basis.

This applies to water quality as well. If the member goes into the area of water quality, which I know he did not explore in Washington but which would have been a useful subject, he would have found that this province—

Mr. Rae: You are wrong; we did.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am sure they told him this, and he must have come home feeling some sense of pride: if he did speak to them about water quality, the American authorities who are knowledgeable would have told him that Ontario has met its commitments and has done far more than any bordering state on the Great Lakes with respect to water quality. If he got objective

advice from EPA or others, they would have told him that is factually correct.

Getting back to Ontario Hydro: the member makes a distinction because it is a public utility. I do not know how relevant that is. I do not say government is not involved if it is a public utility, but does it really matter whether it is a public utility or whether it is Consolidated Edison? Surely one is not going to have separate ground rules for utilities just because one is in the private sector and one is in the public sector. I do not think one can in logic draw that distinction.

If we go back to what has been said, surely the criterion is the reduction of emissions. The question of the technology or the process that is used is up to Ontario Hydro. As I recall it, and the Minister of the Environment can correct me if I am wrong, there has been no alteration in either the orders or the commitment of Ontario Hydro. There may be some thoughts as to how they meet the requirements of reduction in emissions. Surely the member is not going to say to Ontario Hydro that scrubbers are necessarily the only way it can be done.

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, surely the Premier will agree that is not the point. The point is that he made a promise in his throne speech to install two scrubbers, and he broke the promise. That promise, which he and the chairman made on more than one occasion, has been trumpeted throughout the Congressional Record. It was referred to by Ambassador Gotlieb in his speech here in Canada a couple of weeks ago at the acid rain dinner as a major sticking point and an indication of bad faith by Canadians.

It is the Premier's broken promise that is the issue. Will he not agree with that and will he not now undertake to rectify that broken promise?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, this is one of the problems with the Leader of the Opposition. He does not understand what is happening.

I think the record will show that Ontario Hydro's commitment—and it was volunteered, as a matter of fact—was to reduce emissions by 50 per cent by 1990. The honourable member will find that is on the record. There is no question in our view that Ontario Hydro will meet that objective by 1990.

I cannot guarantee the Leader of the Opposition that because he becomes wedded to a particular technology—that is why his policies are so intransigent, those that do not alter from day to day—we will say to Ontario Hydro that is the only way it is to attack this problem. I am not going to dictate to Ontario Hydro, with respect

to using scrubbers that may or may not be outdated in technical terms in two or three years, that it should not be approaching some other method of reaching that objective. Surely the objective is to reduce emissions; I really do not think how they do it is a subject of debate.

If the member has had some indication from responsible authorities in the United States, and I say authorities, that Ontario Hydro or Inco is in any way delaying the implementation of the existing EPA standards in the United States, I would like to see him produce that in some form of documentation because I do not think it happens to be factually correct. I would say the same thing to our Canadian ambassador if he were present in this House at this moment.

2:40 p.m.

Mr. Rae: The point the Premier seems to be missing is that the existing EPA standards have to be changed if we are going to see significant reductions. That is why to talk about the existing EPA standards as something we in Ontario should be proud to live up to is totally inadequate when it comes to attacking the problem of acid rain rather than simply living with it, which seems to be the approach the Premier is taking.

With respect to Inco, the last control order, regulation 301, mandated a reduction from 2,500 tons per day to 1,950 tons per day beginning in 1983. Given the fact that this still represents a major contribution in terms of SO₂ emissions, can the Premier tell us first whether it is the government's intention to bring in a new control order this year which will produce substantial reductions from that 1950 level?

Second, can the Premier guarantee that with respect to this control order, there will be a chance at last for the people of Ontario to participate in establishing the level rather than having it settled behind closed doors between the Ministry of the Environment and the company?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Perhaps the member misunderstood me. I was not saying EPA standards are acceptable from our standpoint or anybody else's. The point I was making to the Leader of the Opposition, who I do not think has quite grasped this issue yet, is that the existing EPA standards are not being met by many industries in the United States. If they did not tell the member that in Washington yesterday then he wasted his time.

Mr. Rae: I know that.

Hon. Mr. Davis: If the member knows that, why does he not say so? Why does he not give us some sense of balance? Surely he has come home from there understanding just how much progress we have made in Ontario compared to almost any other jurisdiction. Why does he not stand up and say that? One cannot come back from Washington without that awareness.

Regarding Inco, I cannot tell the member whether the existing control order will be altered. I am not in a position to give any indication of that nature. I know the member does not like government working with the private sector to solve these problems but, in terms of total percentage of emissions, the government in conjunction with Inco probably has made as significant an accomplishment in the time frame as any other single industry in North America.

[Later]

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege to correct the record. It relates to a discussion I was having with the Premier with respect to scrubbers. At a press conference on January 26, 1981, the then Minister of the Environment, Harry Parrott, and Ontario Hydro chairman Hugh Macaulay announced the Hydro acid gas control program. Mr. Macaulay stated: "The most significant component in our program will be the design and construction of two sulphur dioxide scrubbers by 1987. It will be a first for Canada, I might add."

Then, in a response to a petition signed by 139 federal MPs objecting to the General Public Utilities deal, Mr. Macaulay wrote a letter dated February 19—

Mr. Speaker: Order. Will the honourable member please resume his seat? It is not a point of privilege, with all respect.

Mr. Peterson: It is a point of privilege to correct the record. There was some discussion about the problem.

Mr. Speaker: No. It is a completely different matter. That was disposed of earlier. It was explained in some detail. It has nothing to do with being a point of privilege.

Mr. Peterson: There was discussion over the nature of the promise, and you know how a promise is very important—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

SECURICOR INVESTIGATION AND SECURITY LTD.

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Solicitor General with respect to Securicor

and the decision of the Ontario Labour Relations Board taken last Friday.

In answering questions in the House on Monday, the Solicitor General suggested that he and his staff were studying the decision with respect to the impact it might have on the licence being granted to Securicor and any other actions the government of Ontario might take. He has now had three days to study the award.

Does the Solicitor General now feel he should register a complaint with the registrar under section 17 of the Private Investigators and Security Guards Act and ask him to take away the licence of Securicor, given the very serious nature of the breaches of the Labour Relations Act and possibly other statutes, including the Criminal Code of Canada, which were found by the Ontario Labour Relations Board to have taken place? Is the Solicitor General now prepared to take those steps?

Hon. G. W. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, as I said in answer to the honourable member's question earlier this week, the investigation by the Ontario Provincial Police, which does the licensing, is ongoing. They are reviewing the decision of the Ontario Labour Relations Board regarding Securicor.

It may be slightly premature to say that is going to be the final result in this matter, because I understand it is going to be appealed. None the less, the OPP and the registrar are investigating the facts and reviewing the judgement. When I receive a complete report, a decision will be made as to whether charges will be laid under the provisions of the Private Investigators and Security Guards Act or if licences should be suspended or removed.

Mr. Rae: This government has delayed for more than a year. The OPP and the registrar have had the information with respect to the activities of Securicor for more than a year. They did not have to wait for the decision of the Ontario Labour Relations Board. That decision is not being appealed on a matter of fact. If it goes to judicial review, it will be reviewed on a matter of law that has nothing to do with the findings of fact by the board and the evidence that appeared. As soon as that evidence was adduced at the hearing, the OPP and the registrar should have been moving with respect to Securicor.

Here is a company and its employees that have been found over a period of time to have broken, and broken without shame or apology, the Ontario Labour Relations Act and to have

attempted to subvert the purposes of that act. How long is it going to be before the minister is prepared to protect the employees in this province from this kind of spying and goon-like activity?

Hon. G. W. Taylor: In answering this question previously on many occasions, I have said there were many witnesses who had to be heard by the Ontario Labour Relations Board. I am sure the member would desire that. Indeed, much evidence was heard at that hearing, and there were many adjournments. I am sure the member would not have wanted the actions of another forum or of the registrar in any way to have inhibited or caused interference in that proceeding before the Ontario Labour Relations Board.

When the member states that we were delaying, I have to tell him that we were delaying to provide all sides an opportunity to have that hearing and to have that forum answer the questions. When he comments on our legislation, I am very proud on the part of government of the legislation we have put forward on behalf of workers. I would say the legislation put forward on behalf of workers in this province, through the Minister of Labour (Mr. Ramsay) and through this government, exceeds and excels any other piece of legislation of any other jurisdiction.

This situation will be resolved in accordance with the legal procedures of this province so that everybody will receive a fair hearing and an opportunity to resolve the matter in a way that will be fair to all parties.

Mr. Wrye: Mr. Speaker, apparently the minister is concerned about a fair hearing for everybody but the employees of places such as Automotive Hardware, who did not get treated very fairly for a matter of months.

The minister referred to further investigations by the OPP and a decision. When is this decision going to be taken? As part of the ongoing investigation and review, is the minister taking a look at issuing new instructions to the OPP and other police forces in Ontario in terms of their activities in these cases of industrial espionage and specifically in the kinds of cases where they were aware of an agent provocateur, as was the case with Securicor in this instance?

Hon. G. W. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, when I hear the honourable member commenting on the particular judgement—the judgement is in excess of 66 pages and is very detailed both in law and in fact—and the investigation leading up to that

by the Ontario Provincial Police, I have to tell him that it is now being reviewed, and I am sure he would not want any precipitate action as a result of the investigation or the material contained therein without some thorough review, without some determination both as to the law that may be the result of changes and as to the charges that may flow out of any of the actions.

When I hear the member state that the police are less than neutral in these cases, I take exception to that, since this is Canadian Police Week. When he can make statements that he believes the police are less than neutral in labour relations and matters of this kind, I must state on behalf of the police that this is totally not correct. Indeed, they are the most neutral participants in situations where it is very difficult at times for them to perform their tasks, in volatile situations that sometimes rise out of strikes and picketing.

Mr. Rae: In the light of the Solicitor General's answers, I wonder whether he will allow me to redirect a question to the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry). If he says yes—I gather he has—I wonder whether I could redirect my final supplementary to the Attorney General with respect to this decision of the Ontario Labour Relations Board.

Mr. Speaker: Did the Solicitor General redirect?

Hon. G. W. Taylor: I did not reply "yes" to that, Mr. Speaker. If the member wants to ask another question of the Attorney General, that is within his limit and within the rules of the procedure.

Mr. Rae: I take it then that the minister is saying he does not want the Attorney General to answer a question with respect to this.

Hon. G. W. Taylor: No. I think the Attorney General has great liberty to answer any question—

Mr. Speaker: Order. The member for York South; final supplementary to the Solicitor General.

2:50 p.m.

Mr. Rae: I will put the question to the Solicitor General. Is he prepared to enter into discussions with the Attorney General with respect to possible criminal prosecutions in this matter, given the statement in paragraph 63 by the Ontario Labour Relations Board about the kind of conduct that occurred and given the clear statement made by the Minister of Labour in April 1982 that where there has been some kind of conspiracy, or attempt to enter into a conspiracy, to breach the Labour Relations Act

that in itself amounts to a breach of the Criminal Code? Is the Solicitor General prepared to enter into this discussion?

Hon. G. W. Taylor: I am prepared to discuss anything, any time, anywhere with my colleague the Attorney General. He is very knowledgeable of the routine in police matters. Investigations done by police are often done in consultation with the crown law officers; and at a particular time, when the investigations are complete, they are usually reviewed by the Attorney General in collaboration with the Solicitor General. Sometimes a determination is made to continue with the procedures, be it under a municipal statute, a provincial statute or the Criminal Code, and those procedures are carried out in consultation with the Attorney General.

I reiterate to the member that at no time would I not want to talk to my colleague the Attorney General.

CONVERSION OF RENTAL UNITS

Mr. Ruprecht: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations. The minister has received various requests to help stop the conversion of apartment units into hotel-like accommodations. He is aware that these conversions take place right across Metropolitan Toronto. Has he informed himself how many units and how many tenants are involved in these conversion processes and how that change has affected community life?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, I think we have to put the whole issue into perspective. The issue really relates back to a time of minority government, when the Residential Tenancies Act was passed. The Legislature in its wisdom decided at that time that, under certain conditions, certain types of residences such as hotels would be exempt from section 4 of the legislation. That in no sense meant that section was to be used to subvert the purposes of the Residential Tenancies Act.

The honourable member knows full well the position taken by the Residential Tenancy Commission in many cases, particularly in many that are under appeal now, has been that the conversion attempt was not appropriate. Since those decisions are under appeal, I am not prepared to discuss them further at this time.

The member also knows there was a motion by one of the landlords to declare that such evictions for the purpose of conversion were outside the Landlord and Tenant Act. That position was not upheld and it is under appeal.

He knows very well these issues, which were attempts to subvert the purposes of the Residential Tenancies Act, are before the court.

Mr. Ruprecht: I am sure many people are looking to the minister for some guidance and leadership to try to solve the problems being raised by these specific conversions. I do not want to give the minister another chance to hide behind the Thom commission, or another commission, and have him say, "I can't talk about this, because it is before a commission," or "I can't talk about this, because it is before something else."

Is the minister aware that some tenants in these buildings are being asked to sign a form, upon moving into their apartments, that is in effect an undated agreement determining the tenancy? The landlord then uses this form to evict tenants without proper notice, when it suits his purpose, by filling in the appropriate date.

In a decision dated November 5, 1982, concerning a case of this nature, county court judge Haley found the landlord's behaviour was "a deplorable attempt to subvert the mechanism of the Landlord and Tenant Act." The tenants who went before Judge Haley were lucky, but dozens of other tenants in similar circumstances returned home to find themselves locked out. Many of these cases have been documented, but even when landlords are caught, there is no automatic penalty that can be imposed on them, because the act does not contain appropriate provisions.

I am sure the minister does not condone this kind of action. If he does not, is he prepared to stand up here and tell the House how he will stop this practice?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: If I may address the ad hoc prologue first of all, I think any attempt, by the member particularly, to try to pretend that this minister hides behind anything is so ridiculous that everybody on his side of the House should be laughing at him; and I think most of the time they are, to tell the truth.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: I am just enchanted, as I am sure all the other members are, that the only specific example the member gave outside of his generalities was the specific case where the judge said that the practice was deplorable. Let us have some more specifics instead of his generalities.

INCREASED ARMAMENT PRODUCTION

Mr. R. F. Johnston: Mr. Speaker, my question is for General Walker, the Minister of Industry and Trade. Forgetting for a second the moral question of whether or not we should be promoting the increase of armament production in this province, let us look for a second at the economic reasons for getting involved.

Is the minister aware that Sam Gindin, the United Automobile Workers research director, is quoted as saying: "Resources spent on the military are a diversion from resources spent on goods and services. In fact, a number of studies done in the US show that each billion dollars invested in the military could have provided more jobs if invested elsewhere?"

Does the minister know that for that \$1 billion the military would create, directly and indirectly, 76,000 jobs? In construction it would create 100,000 jobs, in health services 139,000 jobs and in education 187,000 jobs. Would he not agree there are better ways of creating jobs in Ontario than by encouraging increased arms production?

Hon. Mr. Walker: Mr. Speaker, I suppose there are tens of thousands of veterans in this land who probably think the honourable member's comment, which is really about giving in on any kind of deterrent around the world, is the way he would like the world to be. That is the kind of Neville Chamberlain approach that has been around a little bit too much.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Walker: I think the member might realize that in this country—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Walker: The member has to realize that something approaching 50,000 jobs in this province are related to it; and if he thinks it is a diversion, if he thinks we should shut down all of the industry in Ontario that might be related to defence, then I suspect maybe the member should start looking at his own riding.

The first place they would shut down is the Canada Metal Co., and the Energy and Chemical Workers Union might have some concern about it; the member might speak to them in his riding. He might speak to Bayview Metals in his riding, because they too would have to close down under his formula. He might also speak to Amphenol Canada Inc.; they also would have to close down. He might speak to the hundreds of

workers there who think that what they are doing is a very legitimate industry.

Before the member wipes away an industry, he should think about some of the jobs in the process. When he starts to think about some of the jobs, maybe he will reconsider a little bit some of his rather foolish thoughts.

Mr. R. F. Johnston: The minister might have noticed that I did not suggest we should be shutting down what we are doing. What I said was that we should not be advocating an increase in our armaments.

What more would the minister want us to do to increase our armament production? In the past two years our federal budget has increased by 35 per cent in armament production and defence spending in Canada. We have a defence production sharing agreement with the United States that right now guarantees us access to the US market with exemptions from their tariffs. We also have a defence incentives program by which the Canadian government encourages companies to bid on American defence contracts as if they were already tooled to meet the requirements. If the company gets the contract, our government picks up the cost.

What does the minister think Ontario should do to add to the present incentives that are already there for the armaments reduction?

3 p.m.

Hon. Mr. Walker: I never made any comment that would suggest Canada should increase its expenditures in defence, although I must say we should maintain our obligations under the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and we should maintain our obligations under the North American Air Defence Command. The member for Scarborough West talks about a nuclear-free zone. Is "No-Nuke Johnston" what they call him?

When I look at the kind of production we already have in this province, the kind of capability we have, the obligations we have around the world in terms of the defence of Canada and the defence of the western world, I think we have to take our fair stand. For the member to stand here and suggest, with the kind of gall he is putting forward, that we should ignore all the freedoms that have been fought for, is absolute hypocrisy on the member's part.

Interjection.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I ask the minister to reconsider the use of that word.

Hon. Mr. Walker: Which word was that, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: It was "hypocrisy."

Hon. Mr. Walker: I do not think "hypocrisy" necessarily applies to his words.

Mr. Mackenzie: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege: As a veteran, I feel I have been insulted by the minister's sleazy remarks about appeasement and the inference that we are Neville Chamberlain types.

FLOOD PLAIN MAPPING

Mr. Haggerty: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Premier: Is the Premier aware of the recent article in the Welland-Port Colborne Tribune dated May 12, 1983, concerning flood plain policy changes? The article stated that the executive of the provincial Progressive Conservative association had been informed by the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Pope) that "flood plain criteria will undergo some major changes in the immediate future." Alderman Len Hallborg was quoted as saying the minister specified three major changes, including "the one-in-500-year storm will be replaced by a one-in-100-year determination" and "a two-zone concept will be implemented wherein building will be permitted within flood lines."

Can the Premier confirm now that changes in the flood plain policy will take place and that concerned citizens in the regional municipality of Niagara can expect some measure of relief from the present land restrictions now in force under present flood plain criteria?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member will recall a very pleasant day a few days ago that I shared with him and his colleague the member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Kerrio), the former at the opening of a major new facility in his riding where incidentally—he was not at all embarrassed—the virtues of the government were extolled by everyone present. After leaving there I went to the opening of the new Ontario Paper plant where, once again, the member for Niagara Falls enthusiastically applauded what was being said.

Mr. Ruston: This has nothing to do with the question, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It does, and they both enjoyed it. I do not know whether they were the member's constituents, but I met with some of those interested in this subject. Actually I think it was at the Ontario Provincial Police detachment in Welland. They conveyed their concerns to me. I told them the member for Brock (Mr.

Welch) had already made representations on this particular issue.

I understand certain documentation has been sent to many members, including myself. Members of my staff are taking a look at it. There will be conversations with the Minister of Natural Resources, and I think there were two or three individuals in Welland, not too far distant from the member's riding, that we will be back in touch with fairly shortly.

Mr. Haggerty: In his last comment the minister says, "It shows that we have a provincial government that is caring and willing to respond to the people's wishes."

When can the Niagara region expect some new policy guidelines in flood plain mapping? I am sure the Premier is aware of the heavy expenditure by the Ministry of the Environment to put in hard-core services in the town of Fort Erie. Now, because of flood plain mapping criteria, the town cannot develop either the industrial park or subdivisions. When can we expect an answer?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think I heard the early part of the question when the member said we had a caring and sensitive government. I totally agree with that and I thank him for the statement. Is that not what he said?

Mr. Haggerty: I was only quoting.

Hon. Mr. Davis: He did not tell me when he was quoting. If he does not want to distinguish, I just accept what he said.

Mr. Roy: They will keep voting for him no matter what the Premier says; so the Premier should not worry about it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I do not worry about it.

Mr. Speaker: Never mind the interjections, please.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member will tell his colleague that on that lovely morning in his community I made no attempt to discredit him. I just pointed out to him the error of his ways and how philosophically all he had to do was walk 22 feet. I think that is roughly what I said. We will be in touch shortly.

AUTOMOTIVE PARTS INDUSTRY

Mr. Cooke: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Premier whether he would be willing to place before the Legislature an all-party resolution that would endorse the content provisions recommended by the auto task force and put additional pressure on the federal government

to implement that legislation as quickly as possible so we can get the jobs here in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I was intrigued by the opening question by the Leader of the Opposition, because all he really asked the Minister of Industry and Trade (Mr. Walker) was whether he agreed with what was in the throne speech.

I had no advance knowledge of the task force report, but my recollection is that one of the main ingredients in the report found its way into the excellent speech by the Lieutenant Governor. Is that the honourable member's recollection?

As to whether there would be a resolution of this House, I do not minimize the potential of that, but with the greatest of respect I say that I think a lot of homework needs to be done; the report itself has to be assessed. I cannot give a commitment that a resolution passed by all parties of this House would necessarily have that impact or is necessarily the right route to go.

I understand the point of view of the New Democratic Party. Let us assess what is happening in Ottawa at the same time as we are assessing the report here.

Mr. Cooke: I specifically mentioned the one aspect of the report. The government went on record after we pushed it into going on record in favour of content legislation; at the provincial level the Liberal Party has finally gone on record in favour of content legislation; and this party is on record in favour of content legislation.

Will the Premier start negotiations with all three parties to draft a resolution that could be presented in this Legislature and passed quickly, putting pressure on the federal government for content legislation? If the National Assembly in Quebec can do it, surely Ontario, with 90 per cent of the jobs in the auto sector, can do it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Before the members over there become so enthusiastic—and I will not go through the chronological order—I think one may find the government of this province introduced this concept as early as, if not earlier than, the New Democratic Party.

3:10 p.m.

Mr. McClellan: Bravo! Did you invent the radio?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am one of those who look for practical solutions to problems and, with no disrespect to the concept of an all-party resolution calling on the government of Canada to pass content legislation, I really think in fairness that it is perhaps overly simplistic. It might not

produce the desired results, although I am prepared to assess it.

If the honourable member is asking me today whether we should introduce such a resolution, I cannot give any such commitment. But I have made note of the support of the member for—where is he from?

Mr. Cooke: Windsor-Riverside.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Windsor-Riverside.

GOVERNMENT HIRING POLICIES

Mr. T. P. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the secretary for resources management, if he would like to—

Mr. Roy: It's a big day for you, Lorne; two questions.

Mr. Speaker: Proceed, please.

Mr. T. P. Reid: In the absence of the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Pope), I would like to ask the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development if he is aware of the hiring policy of the various ministries in his resource field with respect to seasonal and contract work. Can he assure the House, for instance, that particularly in northern Ontario but also in the local regions those people will be the first ones to have the seasonal and contract jobs, especially those through the Ministry of Natural Resources, and that they will not lose out in getting that employment to people who are referred from head office in Toronto, either through the ministry's office or through certain ministers?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Mr. Speaker, the minister happened to mention to me recently that he had a recommendation from this honourable member for someone who needed work. The government is doing everything in its power to make work for the young people and the native people across northern Ontario, and it is looking after our people. Beyond that, I will ask the Minister of Natural Resources to respond to the question.

Mr. T. P. Reid: When the minister talks to the Minister of Natural Resources, will he ask him—and perhaps this minister would like to involve himself in it as well—to ensure that people who have worked on seasonal and contract work in the past for four and five years, especially for the Ministry of Natural Resources, should be hired first and not be bumped by people from southern Ontario particularly?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: I will certainly bring this to the attention of the minister, but I can tell the honourable member that our Ministry of

Natural Resources takes care of the people in the local areas.

Mr. Wildman: Mr. Speaker, will the minister ensure when he is discussing this with the Minister of Natural Resources that those individuals who have been working for the ministry on seasonal jobs and contract jobs for a number of years will not now lose their positions to people who are being hired on Canada-Ontario employment development projects, since the ministry seems to see this as a way of saving money?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is bringing in another aspect. As he knows, the government of Canada requires us to hire those people through that program; they are really not the regular contract employees whom the member for Rainy River (Mr. T. P. Reid) was referring to, I do not believe. I think he is confusing two different levels of contract, but I will bring it to the attention of the minister.

RESPONSE TO ORAL QUESTIONS

Mr. Speaker: I would just like to comment on something perhaps all honourable members are not aware of.

I hear interjections from time to time that various ministers are not addressing the question at hand, and I would point out that the standing orders do not provide me with any authority to rule or to persuade any minister to answer any questions. In fact, the standing order says quite clearly that ministers may, if they so wish, decline to answer.

Mr. Nixon: On that point of order, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: It is not a point of order. I just thought it was a point of information.

Mr. Nixon: May I raise a point of order with your permission?

Mr. Speaker: All right.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, is there not some other reference to relevancy there?

Mr. Speaker: Not that I know of.

Mr. Nixon: Is it not your job to see the answers are at least somewhat relevant to the questions and not just excursions out around the garden path? I think you will find your responsibility is in some degree to keep the answers relevant; and I would certainly hope that if you do not read it as such, you would accept the responsibility so to do, although it is a very tough job, I can see.

Mr. Speaker: If I may comment further, I do have that authority and discretion in debate, but not during the oral question period.

NOTICE OF DISSATISFACTION

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to standing order 28, the member for Algoma (Mr. Wildman) has given notice of his dissatisfaction with the answer to his question given by the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Mr. Henderson) concerning the changes in the draft agreement between the provincial government and the Islington band. This matter will be debated at 10:30 this evening.

POSSIBLE CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Mr. Di Santo: Mr. Speaker, on a point of personal privilege: I wonder if you could make a ruling. Recently, I have been appearing before the Residential Tenancy Commission. Commissioner Sheldon Kert made some remarks on May 13 that MPPs should not appear before the commission, that they were there to intimidate the commissioners and that, in view of the fact that MPPs represent the riding, by choosing to represent tenants before the commission they are in a position of conflict of interest.

In view of the fact the tenants—

Mr. Speaker: Order. Could we have the indulgence of the House? I ask all honourable members not to carry on their private conversations in the House please, including the member for Huron-Bruce (Mr. Elston).

Mr. Di Santo: I wonder whether the Tories are interested in listening. Of course, they do not have those problems; they do not represent the tenants.

If we accepted the proposal made by the commissioner that the MPPs may not represent their constituents, the tenants, because of a supposed conflict of interest, we would end up with a situation where the tenants would be deprived of representation. Is that not a deprivation of our privileges as members of the Legislature?

Mr. Speaker, could you make a ruling on that or make representation to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Elgie)?

Mr. McClellan: Mr. Speaker, very briefly on the same point: This is a very important point of privilege my colleague has raised. It has to do with our capacity to represent our constituents. Before you make a ruling on this matter, sir, I want to request that you consult with the minister responsible for the administration of

these tribunals—I understand it is the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry)—and determine from him whether there is some policy in force against citizens appearing at the rent review tribunal being represented by members of this Legislature, or whether that commissioner was acting in violation of policy.

Mr. Speaker: Interesting as it may be, it is not a point of privilege, personal or otherwise. I would venture a guess that the commissioner was offering an opinion. I would be very surprised if members of the Legislature were precluded by legislation; I just do not know. I am sure both the minister involved and the Attorney General will take this matter under consideration and will correspond directly with the members involved. It does not constitute a proper point of privilege.

3:20 p.m.

PETITION

TRAILER PARK AT ELLIOT LAKE

Ms. Coppins: Mr. Speaker, I have a petition to the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario, which reads:

"We, the undersigned, beg leave to petition the parliament of Ontario as follows: That you will persuade Denison Mines Ltd. to lease or sell to the municipality of Elliot Lake the land now occupied by the Stollery Lake Trailer Park in order to preserve the homes of its 80 resident families."

This petition is signed by more than 100 residents and calls upon all the members of the Legislature from all political parties, and the ministers of the present government, to make a most sincere and concerted effort to encourage Denison Mines Ltd. to be most generous in its response to the request from the municipality of Elliot Lake for control of the trailer park.

REPORT

Mr. Robinson: Mr. Speaker, for the first time as chairman, it is my privilege to beg leave to present a report from the standing committee on social development.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Robinson from the standing committee on social development reported the following resolution:

That supply in the following amount and to

defray the expenses of the Provincial Secretariat for Social Development be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1984:

Social development policy program,
\$11,624,800.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

INSTITUTE OF MANAGEMENT CONSULTANTS OF ONTARIO ACT

Ms. Fish moved, seconded by Mr. Robinson, first reading of Bill Pr26, An Act respecting the Institute of Management Consultants of Ontario.

Motion agreed to.

COMPENSATION FOR VICTIMS OF CRIME AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Kennedy moved, seconded by Mr. Jones, first reading of Bill 44, An Act to amend the Compensation for Victims of Crime Act.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Kennedy: Mr. Speaker, this bill is to extend the eligibility for compensation under the Compensation for Victims of Crime Act, 1971, to persons who have been imprisoned for an offence and whose convictions are subsequently quashed. The victim would receive compensation for expenses actually incurred and pecuniary losses resolving from the imprisonment.

HUMAN TISSUE GIFT AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Van Horne moved, seconded by Mr. Nixon, first reading of Bill 45, An Act to amend the Human Tissue Gift Act.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Van Horne: Mr. Speaker, this bill is intended to facilitate the obtaining of human organs for transplant purposes. An automated central register of consents and objections to the use of organs for transplant purposes after death is contemplated to allow physicians to ascertain deceased persons' wishes more readily.

Where no objection by a deceased person has been registered and there is no reason to believe the deceased had or the deceased's next of kin have any objections, removal of organs for transplant is authorized without the specific consent that otherwise would be required.

Section 29 of the Coroners Act deals in a similar fashion with the removal of human pituitary glands used in the treatment of persons suffering from growth hormone deficiency.

LANDLORD AND TENANT AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Boudria moved, seconded by Ms. Copps, first reading of Bill 46, An Act to amend the Landlord and Tenant Act.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to provide increased protection for tenants residing in mobile home parks who are forced to move from a park by a landlord who requires possession of the park for certain purposes. The act currently requires the landlord to give the tenant at least 120 days' notice before terminating the tenancy agreement. The bill increases this notice period from 120 days to one year.

This is a reintroduction of a previous bill that was vetoed by the government. I hope this time the member for Algoma-Manitoulin (Mr. Lane) will not veto the bill.

MOTION TO SET ASIDE ORDINARY BUSINESS

Mr. Mackenzie moved, seconded by Mr. R. F. Johnston, that pursuant to standing order 34(a), the ordinary business of the House be set aside to discuss a matter of urgent public importance, that being the conspiracy between Automotive Hardware Ltd. and Securicor Investigation and Security Ltd. to subvert the laws of the province, particularly the Labour Relations Act; and whether the actions of Securicor were known to and condoned by police as alleged by Securicor and reported in the Ontario Labour Relations Board's decision of Friday, May 13, 1983; and the continuing threat posed to Ontario's collective bargaining system by the use of undercover agents, provocateurs and strikebreaking firms such as Securicor by employers in this province.

Mr. Speaker: I would like to advise all honourable members that the motion was indeed received in time, at 11:40 this morning. I will be prepared to listen to the honourable member for up to five minutes as to why he thinks the ordinary business of the House should be set aside.

Mr. Mackenzie: Mr. Speaker, the motion before us is a serious one because its implications strike at the very heart of equal justice in Ontario.

On page 32, section 1, of the Ontario Labour Relations Board decision concerning Securicor and Automotive Hardware, Securicor argues, "If the board finds its involvement to have been inherently unlawful, it will be breaking new

ground on the basis of actions which were known and condoned by two sets of police."

Clearly, the police knew from the beginning of the strike that a private security investigator had infiltrated the union. In testimony before the OLRB on May 27, 1982, Ontario Provincial Police Constable Larry McClure testified that both the OPP and the Metropolitan Toronto Police knew that a Securicor agent was amongst the pickets from the beginning of the seven-month strike. They knew that David Ivers was licensed as a private investigator, had infiltrated the picket line and was receiving strike pay. McClure testified there had been problems in past strikes where an agent had infiltrated.

When pressed in February by the steelworkers as to the status of Ivers, McClure did not acknowledge that he was a security agent until he had first warned the president of Securicor.

Sergeant Gaylor of the Metro Toronto police force was asked Ivers's status back in October and suggested they should ask Ivers themselves. The president asked him if he was a spy or a security agent and he denied he was. From the beginning the police were aware that Ivers had infiltrated the union and the board's decision clearly states this infiltration was illegal.

3:30 p.m.

Does anyone believe that if the union infiltrated the company's personnel department to pass on information, and the police knew of the situation, they would not have immediately notified the company?

I now quote from one of the OLRB reports, one of September 17. Immediately prior to the strike, Mr. Ivers asked Automotive Hardware if there is any "specific information the company requires or any misinformation they would like delivered and any suggestions I could make to the union on behalf of the company that could help them in the situation?"

Clearly, there was a conspiracy and the board is harsh in its condemnation. There is clear evidence of the counselling of theft and a variety of illegal activities. Apart from these actions and whether or not the police knew that he would be involved in these actions, they did know that he had infiltrated the picket line. The purposes are obvious and that in itself has clearly been ruled as being illegal.

A reading of the Private Investigators and Security Guards Act clearly establishes that a company carrying on the business of providing private investigators must be licensed. This act also provides for suspension or cancellation of a licence in section 14. At the discretion of the

registrar of private investigators and security guards, he may suspend or cancel a licence where,

"(a) the licensee is convicted of an offence under the Criminal Code (Canada) or under this act or the regulations;

"(b) the licensee is in breach of a term or condition of the licence; or

"(c) in the opinion of the registrar, to do so is in the public interest."

It is also interesting to note that the registrar is a member of the OPP.

We have asked repeatedly in this House for action against professional strikebreakers. One can refer to Hansard of July 2, 1981, and April 2, 1982. Here, I would like to give a quote from the Minister of Labour (Mr. Ramsay) at the time, in dealing with our questions about Securicor: "it is a criminal conspiracy for two or more persons to act in concert with the intention of contravening federal or provincial legislation." That is exactly what went on in this particular case.

We also raised the question in 1982 on April 15, 16 and 19, May 7, June 18 and October 12, and on February 15, 1983, and since, outlining some of the serious allegations that have been made.

It is not just the activities and the undercover work and the counselling of theft we are concerned with, it is the fact that it was clearly outlined as an illegal activity to infiltrate in itself. From the beginning of the strike the police were aware—both the Metro police and the OPP—that an agent had infiltrated this picket line. The question has to be asked as to how we or workers can expect justice when the minister seems unwilling to act in the presence of overwhelming evidence before him. We feel it is a matter of urgent public importance that this issue be debated if we are going to have equality of justice in Ontario.

Mr. Wrye: Mr. Speaker, our party will support the motion of my friend the member for Hamilton East (Mr. Mackenzie). I am somewhat bothered by it in one sense and I want to explain that at the outset. These motions for emergency debates—and this one specifically—may not be in the narrowest sense of the words "of urgent public importance," but we are urged and persuaded on our part that this is a very important and very serious matter.

The report the honourable member has just referred to is a damning document on this government and on the failures of this government to protect workers in this province, not in

the specific narrow instance of Automotive Hardware but in a general policy framework.

It is the view of this party that such important matters are of extreme importance to so many thousands of workers that they deserve the attention of this Legislature. It would have been our wish, it would be our hope, that in the future, for example, these would be the kinds of issues that could be subject to referrals and to a full in-depth discussion with members of all parties and with the ministers involved, but that is not the way we can do things today.

Of course, we could send out the annual report of the Solicitor General or that of the Ministry of Labour, but with a Tory majority we know what would happen to those. It happened in the case of Astra/Re-Mor, and it happened with Hydro, Morley Rosenberg and Cadillac Fairview. The fact is, we would not have a forum to discuss the contents of the report.

It is very important that the content of this issue be discussed on the floor of this House in full assembly at the first possible opportunity. That is what we hope will happen this afternoon.

I am rather bothered by the Solicitor General's response to me in this House this afternoon. He tried to set up, I thought, the phoney war as if we on this side were being anti-police and attacking police. I think all members in this assembly have the greatest respect, in Canadian Police Week and every other week, for the forces of law and order which have done so much in so many positive ways in this province. We are concerned, however, not so much because in a sense we are going after the police but because this government has not indicated to the police forces of this province the actions, legislatively, it wishes them to follow—to restore full and obvious and complete neutrality.

It is clear to me, it was clear to the board, that in the case of this single instance, and in previous cases, the essence of neutrality was indeed missing. Very clearly, both the Ontario Provincial Police and the Metro police were aware at a very early stage of the infiltration of the union by Mr. Ivers, and of the fact there could be some activity which could have a very detrimental effect on the strike.

The evidence brought before the board indicates that is exactly what happened, yet it was not until the moment at which the Steelworkers union was in effect about to unmask this gentleman that the police came forward and said there was an agent provocateur and confirmed the matter to the union.

It is very important for good labour relations

between employers and employees in this province that we change the activities of these professional strikebreakers, whose very livelihood often, and certainly in this case, is tied to provoking and prolonging a dispute, not to good labour relations and a harmonious and early end to the dispute. This is very important because neither the workers nor the employers can afford to have mischievous third parties involving themselves in labour relations and the activities of the employer and the employees, both before and during disputes.

This party will support the member's motion for an urgent debate and will be pleased to join in and suggest some alternatives to put an end to a practice which has gone on for too long in this province.

Hon. G. W. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, we must oppose the New Democratic Party motion for an emergency debate on the matter of the Ontario Labour Relations Board's decision and its implications on labour relations in this province.

Quite simply, an emergency debate at this time would be, I believe, inappropriate and premature. It is my understanding that Securicor, through its legal counsel, will be seeking a judicial review of the Ontario Labour Relations Board's decision which gave rise to these very important—and I emphasize “very important”—legal issues. We would not wish to prejudice any review of that decision by debating the matter here today. Moreover, I feel it is important that we have the opinion of the court on these issues before we fully debate the matter.

As well as the investigating officer, the registration branch of the Ontario Provincial Police is currently reviewing the transcripts from the hearing and the judgement of the board with a view to possible action as a result of reviewing that material.

3:40 p.m.

It was a lengthy hearing. I heard the members opposite mention the number of questions they asked in the Legislature on the subject. I may be incorrect in the matter, but I do recall stating, each time, that there was evidence forthcoming at the Ontario Labour Relations Board from the main participants in this matter and that we were waiting to hear that evidence from all parties. Then there was a decision as a result of that. The decision is a lengthy one.

Mr. Rae: It had nothing to do with the board; it had to do with your own investigation.

Hon. G. W. Taylor: The decision is in excess

of 66 pages, as I mentioned during question period this afternoon.

The decision holds ramifications for both labour relations policies and regulation of security companies in this province. My ministry and the Ministry of Labour are currently reviewing the situation. For that reason, I feel a debate at this time would be premature and inappropriate. The decision indicates there is no evidence to suggest the police acted in any way but properly and neutrally.

Mr. Renwick: Don't let the police investigate themselves.

Hon. G. W. Taylor: I emphasized previously in answer to the allegations, statements and prefatory remarks the members made in the questions they asked earlier that I believe the Ontario Provincial Police and the other police involved in this matter acted in a very neutral and impartial manner, as they have in all these matters.

Mr. Renwick: That is an unbelievable statement. You are supposed to be investigating them.

Mr. Rae: How can you say that when you have not even asked the question?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. G. W. Taylor: In any event, the discussion of the police procedure in this matter would be better dealt with in the ministry's up-and-coming estimates debates. I believe it would be premature to debate the matter now. Those are my comments on the matter.

Mr. Rae: That is a disgrace for somebody responsible for justice in this province. It is unbelievable.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: You had your chance to speak.

Mr. Martel: Well, it is over. Read what the report says.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I have listened with great care and very intently to the submissions that have been made. It is my opinion, on reading the standing orders, that I must rule against the motion because it does not comply with the standing orders.

Mr. McClellan: How does it not comply?

Mr. Speaker: I do not think I have to justify my decision. I have done so in the past, but I have found the motion is out of order. It is not debatable.

Mr. McClellan: It is challengeable. That is a very inadequate response, sir.

Mr. Cooke: What a silly way to rule.

Mr. R. F. Johnston: You have been challenged, unless you missed it.

Mr. Speaker: No, I did not quite miss it, but I was really appalled by those who were trying to give direction to the Speaker.

Mr. Cooke: We asked for your reasons and you refused to give them to us.

Mr. Speaker: I do not have to give them. The member for Sudbury East.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Shall we find out what is going to happen here first?

Mr. R. F. Johnston: We have a fairly clear idea.

4:42 p.m.

The House divided on the Speaker's ruling, which was sustained on the following vote:

Ayes

Andrewes, Ashe, Baetz, Barlow, Bernier, Brandt, Cousens, Cureatz, Davis, Dean, Drea, Eaton, Elgie, Eves, Fish, Gillies, Gordon, Gregory, Harris, Havrot, Henderson, Hodgson, Johnson, J. M., Jones, Kells, Kennedy, Kerr, Kolin, Leluk;

McCaffrey, McCague, McLean, Miller, F. S., Mitchell, Pollock, Robinson, Runciman, Scrivener, Sheppard, Shymko, Sterling, Stevenson, K. R., Taylor, G. W., Taylor, J. A., Timbrell, Treleaven, Villeneuve, Walker, Watson, Welch, Wiseman, Yakabuski.

Nays

Allen, Boudria, Bradley, Breaugh, Breithaupt, Bryden, Charlton, Conway, Cooke, Copps, Cunningham, Di Santo, Edighoffer, Elston, Epp, Grande, Haggerty, Johnston, R. F., Kerrio, Laughren, Mackenzie, McClellan, McGuigan, McKessock, Martel, Miller, G. I.;

Newman, Nixon, O'Neil, Philip, Rae, Reid, T. P., Riddell, Roy, Ruprecht, Ruston, Samis, Spensieri, Stokes, Swart, Van Horne, Wildman, Worton, Wrye.

Ayes 52; nays 44.

SPEAKER'S RULING

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: I seek the assistance of the Speaker in this matter. We have just challenged the Speaker's ruling. Part of the dilemma for us is that so far this year on three emergency debates the Speaker has chosen, when he ruled them out of order, to

give reasons why he was ruling a motion out of order. Today he chose not to do so. If we are going to have consistency and get away from challenges, having established the practice, it would help the members in the House if the Speaker continued that practice and indicated why he considered something not to be of urgent importance.

Certainly, in today's issue there is a great difference of opinion because of the ruling by the Ontario Labour Relations Board and the serious problems inherent therein. Those of us on this side of the House felt it must be debated to get away from the problems that have confronted the strikers and the people on the picket lines in this situation. For the Speaker simply to say, "I choose not to give a reason," in such a very important situation makes it difficult. He himself set the pattern of ruling on three previous occasions. The only time the Speaker did not indicate why was when he ruled it in order.

It was with great difficulty, Mr. Speaker, and with reluctance that we challenged your ruling today, but we felt we were entitled to a reason based on some precedent for that not being of urgent public importance.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, on that point of order, it seems to me the member for Sudbury East does make a point. If there is going to be some consistency, when you do make a ruling on motions that may be defective in one or another area, it would be helpful to us to have some idea why so that in the future maybe we could have motions that were in order.

I know your ruling is not debatable; I appreciate that. But it would be helpful to us when these motions are being drafted to know if there is a precedent in which a motion was ruled out of order because it was defective in one area so we will not repeat that mistake in the future.

Mr. Speaker: To respond briefly and quickly, if you peruse the standing orders, as I am sure you have done, it is the Speaker's responsibility to rule whether a motion is in order or is out of order, as I did.

You make a good point. I have given reasons in the past, and I did so for the very reasons the member for Ottawa East (Mr. Roy) has brought up—in the spirit of co-operation, pointing out, perhaps, to the honourable members where I felt the weaknesses were in the drafting of the motion. Having done that on at least three occasions, and I suspect it may be even more, I was of the opinion that the direction I had given had been heeded.

I do not want you to misread what I have said.

In giving my opinion I did not state it was not of urgent importance, as you have alleged. I said clearly that my reason for it was that it did not comply with the standing order.

Mr. Martel: In what respect?

Mr. Speaker: I have been over this before on exactly the same thing. I would be happy to discuss it with the honourable member at his convenience later, if he so wishes, or with any other honourable members but I do not think I should take the time of the House.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BUSINESS

Hon. Mr. Gregory: Mr. Speaker, we have agreed among the three parties that, because of the time that has been lost in this previous debate, we could limit the debate this afternoon to the one bill, that being ballot item 1.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Ruston moved second reading of Bill 17, An Act to amend the Legislative Assembly Act.

Mr. Speaker: I advise the honourable member he has up to 20 minutes.

Mr. Ruston: Mr. Speaker, sometimes when one brings in a bill such as Bill 17, one has the strange feeling that perhaps it is not wanted or that it is something one's colleagues on all sides of the House are not very happy with. However, we will wait and see what happens later in the day.

I would like to read into the record the part of the bill that is enforceable:

"(3a) A deduction of \$100 shall be made from the indemnity payable to a member under this section for every day beyond 10 in a session on which the assembly sits and on which the member is absent from the assembly for reasons other than illness, pregnancy and childbirth, or official business."

4:50 p.m.

Let me first say no particular party or member, or my own position as party whip has caused me to present this bill. I started researching the matter some time before I became whip. Rather, it is my concern for the general principle of attendance and the perceptions of the public which have prompted this bill.

As a former municipal councillor, reeve and county councillor, it was my experience that a member would not get paid on our local council unless he attended or was sick. At the council

level, once one was absent, it required a motion of council in order to be paid at a later date.

In attempting to assess the reasons for absenteeism in this chamber, I would like to speak a little about a common misconception of the public, that unless a member is visible in his seat he must be absent from his duty. Many people visiting the Legislature are very disturbed by the small attendance they witness in the House after question period. Naturally, they wonder where their members are.

In most cases, this is due to several concurrent committee meetings as well as the time members spend in their offices making important calls to government officials about problems in their constituencies.

This might be an appropriate moment to mention another serious attendance problem, that of government officials. It is very frustrating when one calls a department head and time after time he is not available. Either they are in a meeting, out for lunch or simply not at their desks; at least, these are the three main excuses I hear.

Another factor for consideration is the invitations received by members to attend functions back in their ridings during the weeks of legislative sittings. When one receives such an invitation to an important function, one must decide what takes precedence, the business of this House or one's riding. Of course, the contact in the constituency can be very important indeed when the next election rolls around; but although the House agenda might appear quite ordinary and quiet, that does not mean an urgent issue may not crop up necessitating an immediate vote.

In discussing attendance matters with other members of all parties, I find those who live within one or two hours' drive of their ridings are invited to many more functions during the week than their colleagues who are much farther from their homes. Another aspect of this question is a member's access to air travel, which is undeniably a great help in getting back to the riding during the week, but is also an enormous expense to the taxpayers of Ontario.

I can recall a story told me by the former member for Kent-Elgin, Mr. Jack Spence, and an excellent member he was, who attended some function in a small village in his riding on a day the Legislature was in session. An individual who was present walked up to him and asked why he was not at Queen's Park looking after their interests. Jack said, "You know, Dick, that really taught me something." However, I must

add Mr. Spence always had an excellent attendance record in this Legislature.

Recently I was asked to attend a function back in my riding on a Wednesday. When I explained it would cost the taxpayers over \$200 for air fare both ways and cab fares, they suggested I appoint a representative to attend on my behalf.

Another reason for lack of attendance in my opinion is the ridiculous idea of having Wednesday be a "cabinet day," a legislative holiday reserved for committees.

Certainly there are changes we could make to the hours of sitting to better accommodate the members who have a long way to travel to attend sessions. I would undoubtedly extend the sittings to Wednesday afternoon and possibly Wednesday evenings as well, and do away with the Friday morning sessions. This would allow members time in their ridings for functions or any other business they might have to attend to.

I have briefly tried to identify some patterns in the reasons for lack of attendance in this Legislature, although I do realize the members are elected by the residents of their ridings and it is to them that a member must be accountable.

In researching this matter through the democratic system, one does not find many hard and fast rules on attendance, nor is enforcement of the rules a particularly high priority in most jurisdictions. However, I would like to share the information I have accumulated with the members.

In what we call the Mother of Parliaments in Great Britain, the attendance of British members of Parliament is not enforced as a rule, either by the House of Commons or by the House of Lords. However, in the event of special business, steps are taken to secure the members' presence. Historically, procedures existed in both Houses which were designed to secure full attendance on days of urgent business and, in the House of Lords, on the occasion of the trial of a peer.

For example, members of the House of Commons who were absent were punished. The penalty in these cases was the forfeiture of the members' wages. Although that penalty no longer applies, the legislative declaration of the duty of a member remains on the statute book and attendance upon the service of Parliament includes the obligation to fulfil the duties imposed upon members by the orders and regulations of the House.

Officially, "It is the duty of every member of the House of Commons to attend the service of

the House." This is declared by two acts which to date have not been repealed.

In the United States House of Representatives, the committee of the whole is usually characterized by low attendance. The work accomplished by the committee is important. However, it is often difficult to obtain adequate attendance by party members even on major issues.

Some of the most important votes in the House are unrecorded. Divisions by voice votes in the committee of the whole House which affect the direction of important legislation are often decided by slim majorities. Since these votes are not recorded formally on an individual basis, there is less incentive for congressmen to be present.

One factor contributing to attendance problems in the House is the noted dissatisfaction with the rules and provisions for debate and the scheduling of business.

Whatever the problems of leadership and parliamentary policy, it is the individual member who exercises the right of true advocacy and bears the responsibility for his attendance in the House. Members' failure to debate can no longer be excused with the words, "Nothing happens on the floor," for attendance would make something happen on the floor and would hold members accountable for their decisions at the same time.

During debates in the Senate, a roll call vote may be used as an approximate index to members' attendance on the floor, but it does not indicate how much of the debate, if any, members heard before voting. Senate votes are marked by chronic absenteeism. In many instances, the Senate must operate without a quorum because attendance is so low. In fact, the rules seem to condone absenteeism in so far as quorum rules can be dispensed with through unanimous consent.

Mr. Wildman: Dispense with the Senate.

Mr. Ruston: This is the Senate in the United States. There are no actual penalties for nonattendance, but in 1972 the Senate members were berated for their poor attendance record by Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield. He said: "We [the Senate leadership] cannot force you if you do not want to face up [to] your responsibilities, but you are doing a distinct disservice to the Senate and to the people whom you have the honour to represent." Penalties for nonattendance are practically nil.

In the Florida state legislature, the matter of attendance is addressed in the following man-

ner: "Every member shall be within the House chamber during its sittings unless excused or necessarily prevented, and shall vote on each question . . . The Speaker may excuse any member from attendance on the House and its committees for any stated period, and such excused absence shall be noted on the Journal. A form is provided for notifying the Clerk. Any member, having answered roll call . . . at the opening of any daily session, or who enters after roll call and informs the Clerk of his presence, shall thereafter be deemed as present unless leave of absence is obtained from the Speaker."

Under the constitution of the state of California, article 4, section 8: "A majority of each House shall constitute a quorum to do business, but a smaller number may adjourn from day to day, and may compel the attendance of absent members in such a manner, and under such penalties as each House may provide."

In New York state, it is stated in more detail that: "In all cases of the absence of members during the session of the House, the members present may take such measures as they shall deem necessary to secure their presence and, in addition to suspending them from the service of the House for a given period, may inflict such censure or pecuniary penalty as they may deem just on those who, on being called on for that purpose, shall not render a sufficient excuse for their absence. For the purpose of securing the attendance of members, a call of the House may be made While a call of the House is in progress, no other business shall be transacted except by order of the House."

In the Canadian Senate, failure to attend on at least one day during two consecutive sessions without an adequate explanation in writing results in the loss of the Senate seat. That is interesting. This rule was apparently applied two years ago.

Each senator is required to provide a written note explaining each day's absence. If, during the course of a session, a senator accumulates 20 days in absence without a written explanation, each additional day's absence during the session without a written explanation results in a fine of \$120 a day.

The Clerk of the Senate is responsible for monitoring attendance and fines are levied in practice. The present session, which is now over two years old, is creating considerable problems due to its length of time. It has extended for two years and they are still allowed the same amount of days off as if it were only a one-year session.

5 p.m.

For the Canadian Parliament in Ottawa, if a member is absent in excess of 21 days in a single session, a reduction of \$150 per day is made from the sessional allowance for unjustified absenteeism. A statement of attendance must be submitted to the clerk assistant on a monthly basis. It was not possible to determine whether fines are imposed often.

Quebec, which has an identical bill to the one I have presented here today, permits a deduction of \$100 for each day beyond 10 on which a member does not attend a sitting of the assembly. However, absence due to illness, maternity or official activity is not counted against the member. Each month, members must sign and submit a declaration justifying their absence from the assembly.

Unjustified absences are recorded and once they reach 10, a fine of \$100 per day is levied. Last year, no fines of this nature were imposed. Normally, however, several fines are levied each year. The largest fine imposed was, apparently, \$900. The responsibility of administering penalties rests with the director general of administrative services.

The Nova Scotia members are expected to attend every sitting of the House unless granted a leave of absence by the Speaker. If a member is absent without permission for more than one day, the Internal Board of Economy may levy a monetary fine. The Speaker expects, and apparently receives, notes from members requesting leave. Nova Scotia does not have a formal roll call and no guidelines for assessing penalties have been established. It appears no member has been censured or penalized for absenteeism.

In Saskatchewan, each member signs a statutory declaration which details his or her personal attendance during the past session and submits it to the Clerk. If a member is absent for more than five days without justification, a deduction of \$50 per day is made from the sessional allowance of \$6,000.

Acceptable justification includes illness with a doctor's certificate, a cabinet minister on government business, or the granting of leave of absence by resolution. If a member is absent for more than half the session, the sessional allowance of \$6,000 is forfeited and the member is paid a per diem of \$75 for each day of actual attendance. This latter rule was, in effect, applied to a member last year.

Staff in the Clerk's office are responsible for administering these rules. Saskatchewan is apparently considering the abolition of the statutory declaration of attendance at the end of each

session and may instead ask members to submit a record every two weeks. This alteration is intended to hasten the process of distributing sessional allowances to members.

The Parliamentary Newsletter of February 10, 1983, details an attendance check for Jamaican MPs' allowances:

"A proposal to base subsistence payments to Jamaican MPs on House attendance was moved in the House of Representatives on 2nd November. The government House leader, Hon. J. A. G. Smith, moved that the standing orders should be amended to stipulate that members would only receive subsistence payments if they were present in the House.

"If a division was called, a member not voting would not qualify for that day's allowance even if he had been in the House earlier in the sitting. Members would not be recorded as absent if they were sick or away on official travel and had notified the Speaker in advance.

"Mr. Smith reminded members the attendance factor was part of the salaries and allowances increase package they approved in December 1981. The necessary changes have been referred to the standing orders committee.

"In a similar move, the European Parliament has decided that members who attend less than half of its meetings in a six-month period will lose half their secretarial allowance."

That gives us a rough idea of things as I perceive them with regard to this type of bill. It is a bill that should be in place. I have no problems with it at all. I think it is something that gives members an opportunity to get away from this place when they have official business back in their ridings and so forth.

I would like to save the balance of my time for a windup.

Mr. Breagh: Mr. Speaker, I read with some interest the proposals that have been put forward by the member for Essex North (Mr. Ruston). In truth, I would like to support his private bill, mostly on a personal basis, because the member is one with whom I have managed to work for some period of time on the standing committee on procedural affairs. I respect his opinion as a decent, honest and hardworking member of the Legislature.

I do have a problem with the legislation which he has put forward and I want to try to give a bit of a balanced perspective on it. I think the temptation is there, and will be felt on all sides, that this is one of those occasions when the members are going to have a chance to suck and blow at the same time, because there isn't a

snowball's chance in Hades that this bill is going to pass. Therefore, the punitive nature of it will never come across. There is a chance to play angel up front this afternoon and say how much they are in favour of this, and then go out and pray, probably for the first time in their lives, that it does not really happen.

I am going to avoid that particular temptation and try to address myself to some of the difficulties. I think the member for Essex North, for example, gave a fairly good litany of different houses, different state senates, parliaments and legislatures, and how they work. One of the difficulties, when one gets around to those places, as some of us have had a chance to do, is one sees that each takes on a set of characteristics by itself.

One of things that disturbed me, for example, when I first went to the Mother of Parliaments at Westminster was that it was a lot different when one got there than I thought. I thought all of those august gentlemen and ladies came to Parliament and sat, as I would certainly have been thrilled to sit, in the House at Westminster.

When one gets there, one finds if they all did that they could not sit because there is not enough room. The nature of that Parliament is quite different from ours in the sense that a rather small group of parliamentarians keeps the place going. A great many others, for a variety of reasons not the least of which is the members are not paid very much there, have to go out and work from nine to five every day. They come in and vote pretty regularly, and sometimes they will come in and speak on an issue that is of great interest to them or their constituencies, but they have quite a different concept of what a parliament is than mine.

One of the reasons I would have liked to have supported this bill is that it does get at something I admit nags at me. In the seven or eight years I have been here, I have probably missed about four or five sitting days, because I personally believe it is my responsibility to be here as much as I can, as often as I can, as painful as it might be. Part of my job is to sit here and listen to views that are contrary to mine, and to try to muster some support for my own point of view. I see that as being an important part of my job as a member of the Ontario Legislature.

I would also conflict with other members in that I believe it is one's job to stand up and say what one thinks about something. There are other members here who are as honourable as I, and as effective as I, who rarely speak in the Legislature. That runs counter to my idea of

what a member of the Legislature in Ontario ought to do. That does not necessarily mean they are not good members. It may mean they have a different set of priorities; it may mean they have talents other than speaking to legislation; it may mean they have decided there are things more important for their constituents than sitting in here.

I think one has to recognize there is a legitimate argument which roughly says that each and every member of the Legislature is an honourable member, and part of his or her wisdom, I suppose, is to decide which is the role he or she will play. I think every one of us does that almost every day. We sit down, probably with one or two people, because we do not have many staff, and decide: "What should the member for Oshawa do today? Should he be at the Rotary Club in Oshawa or down at the gates at a picket line? Should he be in the Legislature, in committee or doing some caucus committee work? What is the most important priority today?"

I think that is fair. Sometimes that means one will not be here. Sometimes it means one will rush in for a vote later at night, even though that is not a particularly sane way to proceed either. But it is part of our tradition. A member makes those judgements and the people in his constituency will then decide if those were the right judgement calls.

When I look at the mechanics of the bill that is before us this afternoon, I have to say one would have to be a particularly dumb and stupid member not to be able to go through this kind of legislation and do whatever one wants. It gives one 10 days' grace, and that is not bad, if one cannot honestly come up with a reasoned excuse which says, according to the explanatory note here, one is on official business or one is sick. Some of us would have a little trouble with the pregnancy clause here, but I am sure one could argue that if one's wife were pregnant there should be a paternity clause as well, as we are doing in many of our union contracts.

Just exactly what is official business? For many of us, official business means giving a speech in the Legislature. For many of us it means being here to vote or listen to an argument. However, for a large number of the members here, official business means cutting ribbons. It means shaking hands. It means being able to drink tea and eat small sandwiches at the same time. There are many versions of what is meant by official business and what constitutes the business of the House. I think, therefore,

there are great difficulties in trying to attack this.

5:10 p.m.

I admit it irks me that on most occasions in this chamber there is barely a quorum. I have enough feeling for the Legislature in Ontario that I recognize there ought to be more participants here. But I also have to admit, flat out, that there are a lot of occasions when I sit in my place to try to find some rational thought as to why I am sitting here listening to this drivel as opposed to being on the phone helping a constituent, in my office replying to some constituent's needs, or in my riding doing some work there.

Each of us has to make that judgement call and then we can, quite frankly, hang on the vine. If people do not like one's particular approach in representing his or her constituency, they are not going to vote for him or her. If they do, then the right judgement call will be made.

It does pose some difficulty, I suppose, as the member for Essex North pointed out in his initial remarks. A lot of legislatures and senates have tried to address themselves to this problem. Two things become clear. The same problem exists everywhere one goes, no matter what one does. It does not matter whether one has to hand in a little attendance slip every day or whether one's value as a member is regarded by his or her attendance in the Legislature. No one has resolved the problem that was probably the instigation of this private member's bill, because it is not a problem one can solve on a group basis.

There have been occasions here when most of the members who are regularly in attendance could have pointed a finger at someone else and said: "He has not been here in three weeks. Where is he, or where is she?" That is probably fair, but I am not sure it justifies sending one off into a whirl of activity to devise some system that will make everybody be here. I do not think that is possible.

If we want members to make a declaration that they were ill, that they were away on official business, that the member's wife was pregnant or that another situation occurred, that is not going to resolve the problem. A member who wants to be away from here badly enough is going to find what is a completely legitimate and plausible reason for not being here.

If the members wanted this kind of legislation they would have to set up some kind of secret service which would determine whether somebody was really sick or absent on official

business, for how long and whether or not they could get back here.

The member addressed himself to some of the other problems of modern-day living. It is tough for me to say to the people in my riding who invite me there on a Wednesday that I cannot make the official opening of a park in Oshawa because I am at the Legislature. They say, "You turkey, you can drive home in 45 minutes; so get here." On Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday I can sometimes make that argument. Things are a little more complicated than this bill would lead us to believe, although I appreciate the thought that is behind it.

I would like to find some magical means that would get the attendance in the Legislature up. I would like to find some different ways of having the business of the Legislature organized so that more people would want to be here. But I am still left with the fundamental problem that part of being a parliamentarian is to decide what one's role will be, what one's personal priorities are. For some of us that means being in attendance at the Legislature all the time that the whip says one has to be here. For some of us it means doing a different kind of work. For some of us it means a great many speeches, and for some of us it means not very many at all.

I am not sure any one of us in here is in a reasonable position to judge another. By our own criteria, we have no problem doing that; but by the criteria of the people whom that person represents, there is only the one judge, and that happens during the course of an election by the people of that particular constituency.

I appreciate the sentiment that is behind the bill. Unfortunately I do not think it is going to do very much for anybody.

Hon. Mr. Gregory: Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to be one of those members my friend the member for Oshawa (Mr. Breaugh) referred to as being ready to suck and blow at the same time. I certainly do intend to support Bill 17 as put forward by my good friend the member for Essex North.

I believe this is the type of bill that results from certain frustrations that have built up in whips over the years. I am not suggesting the member for Essex North is a frustrated person any more than I am as the chief government whip. Frustrations do build when one tries every which way to encourage members to be in the Legislature; and, of course, they are elected to be there.

Mr. Nixon: Offer them committeeships.

Hon. Mr. Gregory: All those good things, we do.

Mr. Treleaven: He tries.

Hon. Mr. Gregory: I try very hard to encourage them.

I believe there is a need for a bill of this type. I am not suggesting for one minute that this bill is perfect, but I intend to vote for it. There are probably some things that could be done with it, which I can get into in just a moment.

What worries me is not so much just absenteeism but increasing absenteeism, which occurs the further one gets away from an election. It sometimes improves as one gets closer to an election. There is a bit of curve there.

For example, on Tuesday night—I do not mind saying this, because it created a certain amount of frustration in me—when we had a vote on a piece of legislation in this House, out of the 69 members I have available, I was able to come up with only 39, which is probably the worst record. I know the members opposite are used to perfection on my part, but this time I had only 39 members. The fact the opposition parties had only about 27 between them helped us to win.

However, when I analysed the figures—and as the members opposite know, we keep good records over here as far as attendance is concerned and where people are and why—

Mr. Stokes: You even schedule your absences over there.

Hon. Mr. Gregory: We certainly do. As a matter of fact, it was made even more painful, because out of the 30 people who were absent, only seven of those had given any indication that they would be absent. The members can imagine my frustration in searching for those other 23. It made it even worse when 13 of them were ministers; 10 of them were private members.

Mr. Philip: Where did you find the member for Oriole (Mr. Williams)?

Hon. Mr. Gregory: I hid them all over the place. I hid them so well I could not find them this time. It was the old Statue of Liberty play I was playing, actually.

Mr. Philip: Tell us where John Williams was.

Hon. Mr. Gregory: I will get to the New Democratic Party in a minute; my friend can bet on it.

Mr. Treleaven: The enemy is over there.

Hon. Mr. Gregory: I was talking to them over there. I am just declaring war. I hope the member for Oxford (Mr. Treleaven) knows it.

The other thing that appears to me to be somewhat of an embarrassment to this House, perhaps even more than just the fact that members are away, is the number of times we are called on for a quorum call. That is a frustrating thing. I do sympathize with members opposite, and sometimes members on our own side, when they call a quorum call. Certainly it is not very nice to sit and talk to oneself, although some speeches I have heard in this House are better given by oneself and to oneself. But when we had the last quorum call, there were 19 members in the House: two New Democrats, one Liberal and 16 members of the government party. Let us be fair, shall we?

The other dangerous part is committee work. A large part of our important work is done in committee. When members just do not show up, and do not give any word, this creates some delay and some problems in holding votes.

I feel all these things contribute to this House not being quite what it should be. Therefore, I support the bill of my friend the member for Essex North. I would like to discuss for a minute some of the particular items in it and how it does affect us.

My friend went over the practices in some of the provinces and the British House of Commons. They even have this kind of bill in the Yukon and the Northwest Territories. Oddly enough, their allowances are a little different, but the price is the same. In the Northwest Territories it is \$100, as it is in the Yukon. However, they only sit in the Yukon for 40 days—

Mr. Kerrio: They don't have anyplace to go.

Hon. Mr. Gregory: This is a great speech. The member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Kerrio) would love it if he would listen.

Mr. Kerrio: No, no. I said in the Yukon they don't have anyplace else to go.

Hon. Mr. Gregory: That is possible; I do not know.

In the Northwest Territories it is also \$100 and they sit only 60 days a year. The free days in the Yukon are none. In other words, if one is away one day without a good reason, one is charged \$100.

Relating to this bill, we on this side would be glad to put together a fund to pay the fines to encourage some of the members opposite to stay away. We would gain a lot of money in there.

I question the 10-day figure. I do not know whether or not that is a good figure. That

actually represents approximately 10 per cent, perhaps nine per cent, of the total average days we sit in this House. Roughly 10 per cent is as good a criterion as any, I suppose, but I do not know that it actually makes sense. I would think that 10 is too many and that we should be working on about five days—anything over five days without good reason, the reasons given in the bill.

5:20 p.m.

The only difficulty I have with that is who becomes the judge and jury. If my friend the member for Essex North is saying that we whips will have the authority to determine the validity of the stories that are told to us, then I am all in favour of that. However, if it is being suggested that an absence from this House to take part in a political activity is a legitimate activity as pertains to this bill, I do not agree with that at all.

I do think some difference has to be made as regards leaders of opposition parties, House leaders and ministers of the crown. I feel their responsibilities are somewhat different from those of private members. There probably should be some difference, some sort of pro rata system that should be worked on.

It is interesting that of the 13 jurisdictions—the 10 provinces, the two territories and the federal government—we are only one of five that do not have something like this. The others are Manitoba, Newfoundland, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island. I do not know that there is any kind of message there, other than that we are not on the boat we should be on. I think we are behind the times.

I suspect the argument many people will give is, "I was elected by certain constituents and consequently I owe it to them to be with them." I am not of the opinion that you are elected to be with your constituents as much as you are to represent your constituents here.

Mr. Elston: Maybe they elected you to send you away.

Hon. Mr. Gregory: I do not know; maybe they did. They did not send me very far; not as far as they sent my friend. As a matter of fact, they sent me to Queen's Park rather than to Ottawa so I could get home and see them every night.

I do think it should be taken into consideration that we are the largest, and probably the richest, province in Canada. Of the 13 jurisdictions, we are one of five. The other four are not nearly as large or as prosperous as we are.

Probably they are not paid nearly as much as we are.

It seems to me there is a need for something of this sort. As I discussed with the member earlier, I certainly will support his bill, and I hope that at some time in the future something can be done to make this a workable bill to bring it in line with the other jurisdictions in Canada and Britain.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the whip of the Liberal Party for bringing in this bill. I think it is typical that not only has he spoken eloquently in its favour but also the chief government whip, in his own inimitable way, has spoken in favour of it. Their frustrations at maintaining attendance must be considerable. From time to time I have shared those frustrations in my responsibilities, first as leader and now for some years as House leader.

We all know of valid reasons why members are not here. Sometimes we have to go home and plant the corn. There might even be more important reasons than that, but presumably if I were doing that, that would be a reason to fork over \$100 a day, since I would be putting my personal responsibilities ahead of the responsibilities I was elected to carry out here.

There was something the whip of the Tory party said a minute ago that I should have written down. I agree with him that we are elected to be here and not balancing cups of tea and being present at every dogfight or whatever in our own constituencies.

I have absolutely no embarrassment whatsoever when I reply to invitations in my constituency, pointing out to them that unfortunately the House will be in session and I will not be able to be there. My mug will not be in the lineup in the Brant News or the Plattsville Bugle, but that is okay; I have to make up for that in certain other ways.

I just want to speak briefly. My late father, who was the member for Brant for many years, used to talk about the early days down here when the session very rarely went for more than four weeks or maybe five weeks. Since a majority of the members happened to be farmers—regrettably that is no longer the case—when the tulips poked up in the front yard of Queen's Park, everybody left whether the House was adjourned or not, because it was planting time and they had to get back and do the first things that had to come first.

There was an occasion, I believe, that our indemnity was established on sitting for 26 days. In one famous session, the work of the House

was completed before that time and just as they came to prorogue, the Clerk pointed out to somebody that they would not get their indemnity since the session had not lasted long enough. Some ingenious leader got up and moved that Saturdays and Sundays be counted as sitting days. They all voted in favour of that and trooped off with their cheques in their pockets.

Perhaps a person does not like to be judgemental in these things, but the thing that sometimes is infuriating is when one finally goes through all the possible reasons for being absent and finds there are certain of our colleagues, I believe in all parties, who have to have a very good reason to be here rather than a very good reason to be absent. Perhaps it is these people, along with the rest of us requiring to be reminded of our duties from time to time, who would benefit from the enactment of this bill. One just really cannot thumb one's nose at this place all the time without having at least some sort of monetary penalty or at least a note from your mother or something like that.

It has been pointed out that the bill might not be as effective as we would hope, but at least it means that at the bottom line we, as a legislature, have a ruling that reinforces what should be our duty, and that is to be here in the House.

Looking back even in my own career, which is about 21 years now, I came into the House just a few weeks after John Robarts became Premier. He was his own House leader and was in the House almost all the time it was in session. He was a bit unsure of himself, which was understandable, since he had just taken on this responsibility, but because the head of the government was there, the cabinet ministers were there all the time.

The government whip said the leaders of the opposition parties and the members of the government ought to be excused more frequently. Perhaps that is so. In those days not so long ago, the Premier could order his business so the prime responsibility of a politician elected to this House was to be here, to listen to the debate and take part when the spirit moved him and the occasion was brought forward. It certainly worked that way and, in those days, the attendance was quite strong on all sides of the House, because there seemed to be something effective happening here.

The relevancy of the House has decreased substantially since then, partly because we have moved some of the estimates out into committees. Because the time required for the review of

estimates has grown to be so great, we cannot possibly handle them here. In my view, we spend perhaps too much time on estimates. At times, it is a self-defeating project in which we simply bore ourselves silly and read things prepared for us, in some instances, by our very competent researchers and speech writers. I do not want to make that as a blanket allegation, but as some members know, it applies to a number of the members who really do not put forward their own views on occasion, when I believe it would be more interesting if they did.

Grinding out this stuff that is used in the Legislature and in committees so extensively, sometimes in some ministerial statements to the extent of a couple of hundred pages of typewritten script, simply defeats the purpose that we are sent here for, and that is to review the business of the House, to express our own views and then to substantiate those views in debate and argument and eventually by our vote. But we have got so far from that by the practices and procedures that we have that I have almost lost hope we can recoup the relevancy that the House must have if it is going to be a viable place where people will want to be in attendance.

5:30 p.m.

I am no admirer, particularly, of former Premier W. A. C. Bennett, but there was a review in one of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association publications in which somebody described the Legislature in British Columbia during his days. He was one of the last unreconstructed Premiers—no Hansard, no question period, but the House was an exciting place. As the Premier used to say, "People do not even like to leave to wash their hands because sure as they do, they are going to miss something important in the House." His argument was that members there had an opportunity to express their views on the expenditures of the government and the bills brought forward and to offer their alternatives to the government.

Frankly, 20 years ago our House was a lot more like that. I certainly do not regret the introduction of a proper question period, but it has become almost the whole of the Legislature. As soon as the question period is over, everybody leaves because everything that goes on here is routine. My experience is that it is often the people who get a little extra pay—such as myself, the whip of the Tory party and maybe the whips of the other two parties—who are here trying to make some semblance of attendance and some semblance of an exchange of views from time to time.

What we are all hoping for and discussing in our caucus is the possibility of certain changes in the rules. Some of the proposals will improve the atmosphere in this House and will make the debate more interesting. The attempt by the Parliament of Canada to introduce some more interesting rules is one we are looking at very carefully, particularly the idea that each speech be followed by five or 10 minutes of rebuttal or comment from other members present. In other words, if one is going to say something in the House, one may very well be checked on it and brought up short at the end of the speech. There is the feeling that some sort of exchange of views can occur.

There are things such as this that I think are going to be interesting. Even in a debate like the one this afternoon where there is a time limit on our speeches, it means that even if a person is not making much sense—which is an opening for some of my colleagues to interject—at least his time is running out. I hasten to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I have only one minute and 20 seconds left—19, pardon me.

These sorts of time limits are ones I would welcome. I know there are arguments among my colleagues who feel one of the legitimate instruments the opposition possesses in any democratic parliament is the use of a speech that reviews fully the alternatives in a government program and in this way applies some sort of pressure on the government to adjust itself in that connection.

I am very hopeful new rules and perhaps the implementation of the implication in the bill that the Liberal whip has put before us today will do a good deal to improve the situation in this House. I have no hesitation in saying that when we are called on to vote, I shall stand up in favour.

Mr. Di Santo: Mr. Speaker, I must confess that I am a little intimidated speaking after the honourable member who just finished speaking because I am not as articulate as he is and since I am speaking against the bill, I will not be able—

Mr. Nixon: Surely not.

Mr. Di Santo: I will not speak against the bill.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Next.

Mr. Boudria: We have talked him into it already.

Mr. Di Santo: Yes. Easily intimidated.

If we needed a bill that would collectively force us to be here, I would rather have opted for the legislation in existence in Texas, where in order to sit the Senate requires a quorum of

12 senators out of 19. If there is not a quorum, the Speaker can ask the sheriff to go into the city and direct the members and bring them in. That is the type of law I would have liked.

If we pass Bill 17, in this spring session any member could have been in the House only six days and still not violate the bill. I do not think the honourable members who spoke in favour of this bill can really argue that being present in the House only six days—one day every two weeks—is effective attendance in this Legislature.

Mr. Boudria: Yes, but in a whole year, the session starts—it is not the same part of the session.

Mr. Di Santo: Mr. Speaker, I will try again. We began sitting in April and we will adjourn at the end of June. During this 12-week period, if any member only sits six days, which means one day every two weeks, he would not violate this bill. I do not think that makes a good argument in favour of having a bill which is—

Mr. Boudria: That is incorrect, Mr. Speaker. You should not let him say it.

Mr. Di Santo: Mr. Speaker, may I defer to the member?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Cousens): No, no. You have the floor and he is just interjecting.

Mr. Di Santo: I am trying to make a rational argument but it does not seem to be getting through. What I want to say is that despite the good intentions of the member for Essex North, this bill is the result of a reactionary ideology. It implies the members of this Legislature do not have enough moral responsibility to make a judgement about their duties and when they should be in the Legislature.

It implies that when they cannot be in the Legislature, there must be some big brother, such as the government whip, who will judge if the member is pregnant. As the member for Oshawa said, many members would have a problem with that. If a member is absent on official business, who will judge what is official business? The government party whip can say that particular business is not official business. It is only justifiable when the cabinet ministers do not come for question period; their absences will be justified.

I believe our role is a dual role. We have legislative duties and some of us with an impeccable attendance record in the House could argue that other members who are not here too often should perhaps be compelled by their moral conviction to attend, but there are other yardsticks by which we should be judged.

There are members who never speak in this Legislature; do the members who support this bill think those members who are warming their seats are doing their duty by just sitting here and not contributing to the debate? Do they not think that our other important role is the advocacy role?

Many people do not feel this is important, I know for a fact, because I have constituents coming to me from ridings represented by Tory members. These members will not take workers' compensation cases because there are workers' advisers. Of course, we have to take those cases and do the job that is not done by members on the government side—provide a service to injured workers. That is not done by some members who think their only responsibility is to stay here in this parliament.

I must say that very often I also missed some ministers at the Workers' Compensation Board, particularly the member for Cochrane South, the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Pope). We go there and we defend our constituents. Is that official business? Is that private business? We go before the rent review commission—and some people may argue that is a conflict of interest—but some of us actually go there and represent our constituents. Now is that official business?

Mr. Philip: We canvass door to door when the House is in session.

Mr. Di Santo: The member for Etobicoke is saying something absolutely inappropriate, so I won't—

Mr. T. P. Reid: He is consistent anyway.

Mr. Di Santo:—respond to his interjection, because there is also time for canvassing but that is not part of our responsibility as elected members. What I am saying is there are other duties that are important. I do not think the judgement should be made by somebody else who is elected like any other member. By virtue of what privilege or prerogative can he say, "What you are doing now is official business," or, "What you are doing now is private business"?

5:40 p.m.

It is up to our consciences to decide if we are to stay here, if we are to speak, in what way we are to contribute to the debate and in what way we have to try to discharge our responsibilities of pointing out to the people of Ontario how wrong the politics of the government are in respect to the issues we think are important. Also, we have to play an advocacy role, which is very important, especially for members like

myself and many other members who represent working class constituencies where there is a lack of government services.

My colleague the member for Yorkview (Mr. Spensieri) can explain the needs of his area. There is only one legal aid service for 120,000 people. Our constituents come to us because, if they go to the legal clinic, there is a waiting list of three or four months. If our constituents need to be represented before a public board or a government agency, they come to us. We have to discharge that duty because it is our responsibility to represent them.

I think the member for Essex North introduced the bill with good intentions, but I do not think we need to be disciplined.

Let me make a final observation. I think the attendance in this Legislature is very good. The member for Essex North mentioned a number of legislatures, parliaments and senates, but he failed to tell us that in many of those parliaments they have very serious problems. He mentioned the European Parliament. I do not want to tell members what happens at the European Parliament.

Mr. Boudria: What does happen?

Mr. T. P. Reid: Tell us what does happen.

Mr. Di Santo: I will do that on another occasion because time is running out. I appreciate the member's intentions, but I cannot vote for his bill.

Mr. J. M. Johnson: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the member for Essex North and Bill 17. I have some difficulty in doing so, because I have a great fear that if I ever support an opposition member's bill, there has to be something about it I have not understood. However, it is fairly straightforward and, if some of the members over there can support it, it cannot be all that bad.

Mr. Mackenzie: Aren't you worried about the storm troopers coming in?

Mr. J. M. Johnson: I think so. That was another day.

I would like to comment on a couple of areas of concern I have. I think there is some inequity in the work load members have in this chamber; perhaps not in work load but in time taken away from a member. The member for Timiskaming (Mr. Havrot), the former Speaker and members from the east and north have more of a burden to carry than many of the other members.

I happen to be fortunate in that I am only about 100 miles away, so I have a two-hour time loss coming and going. I know many members

from the north and east lose practically a whole day. The member for Rainy River (Mr. T. P. Reid) is one. He flies through the United States and I understand he takes a detour once in a while to California.

When we think of attendance in the House, if we want to be fair, we should think of the extra hours required by members who come in from a distance. I know there are members who live in the city who actually go home for lunch and dinner. That is a luxury many members do not have. I, for one, do not have it. I come down on Monday and I get home on Friday. I spend four nights in the city and I am not that impressed with the city.

The member for Essex North should have taken that into consideration because I think it is a legitimate concern. When we talk about attendance in the House we think in terms of the sitting hours of the House, but Wednesday is a committee day, both Wednesday morning and Wednesday afternoon. Many members may not be in the House on Friday, but they spend all day Wednesday in committee. I think that too is important, perhaps more so than sitting listening to a bunch of malarkey.

Mr. Boudria: Watch it now.

Mr. Ruston: There is the member right beside you.

Mr. Boudria: Be nice; the worst one is sitting right beside you.

The Acting Speaker: Order.

Mr. J. M. Johnson: If we do proceed with the bill, and I hope we do, there are a couple of other concerns I would have. One would be, and it has been mentioned by some of the members, in relation to what constitutes official business in the riding. The one concern I have is some members feel it is a priority to be in the House, others feel it is a priority to be in the riding. Some think they are there on constituency business, but many of us if we were honest would think that perhaps we are there to pick up some votes for the next election.

Quite frankly, I agree with the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk (Mr. Nixon) and his comments relating to his father's experience in the House. They make sense. Who was the member who passed that wonderful idea that one had Fridays and Saturdays, or Saturdays and Sundays off?

Mr. Ruston: Mr. Speaker, it has been very interesting listening to the comments of those participating in the limited time. I know there

are some others who would like to speak on it as well, pro or con.

The member for Oshawa remarked it is one of those things one wants, but one does not want to vote for it. He reminded me of the case where a fellow belonged on a council or in this place when one of the bills was coming through for an increase in pay. When the bill came into the Legislature to be voted on, it just went through with no voice call or anything. Naturally, most of our increases in pay go through without objection. He went back and told some of the people in his riding: "I would not vote for that. I went right out in the hallway and I did not go in to vote for that." However, he got his cheque at the end of the month. In a way, I think the member for Oshawa was saying something like that. He wants it both ways, I suppose.

The member for Oshawa also mentioned speaking and the amount of times people speak. That is correct. In fact, I read an article at one time about a member, I think in Ottawa, who was there for 16 years, had never given a speech in Parliament and got re-elected. I am not saying in any way that a person has to come down here and, just because he has a seat in this place, he should make a speech. In other words, everything is taken in Hansard and maybe it would be easier for some of us to get re-elected if we did not talk so much sometimes. They cannot hang a member for what he did not say, but they can for what he did say.

I was glad to have the support of the government whip and understood in a way some of his frustrations he was telling us about. He was being so frank. We appreciate that.

I was glad to hear from the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk, the House leader of the Liberals, with his wide experience. It is interesting in any debate that goes on this Legislature that the House leader for that party is capable of getting up and with his wide experience over 60 years—he is only about 50 years old or maybe we should say 39—he remembers everything his dad told him and everything that went on even prior to his birth. He gives us a wide experience. His father started representing their area and was elected the year I was born so they have been representing their area for 63 years.

Mr. T. P. Reid: 1872?

Mr. Ruston: Yes, 1872.

The member for Downsview (Mr. Di Santo) is a little mixed up. I do not know what he was talking about when he said one could be here one day a week for the six weeks. I think he forgets a session runs from March or February,

whenever it opens. Last year, in 1982, it started in March and ran through until February 1983.

This is not a session; this is only part of a session. The member will learn that after he is here a few more years. It takes time. The member is a fine gentleman, but he has to learn a few things about the operation of the Legislature.

5:50 p.m.

The member for Wellington-Dufferin-Peel (Mr. J. M. Johnson) has some different ideas as far as priorities in the House or in one's riding are concerned. I accept that. That is something one has to decide. People come to me and say they have something important to do in their ridings, and perhaps they cannot be here on a certain day. I tell them that if it is that important, they had better go. I understand that.

After all, the things that go on there are part of what one has to know about. We have a 10-day allowance for a full year or a year and a half. A session can go as long as two years. That is what is happening in the Senate in Ottawa right now where it has gone on so long many of them are having problems attending.

I appreciate the comments the members have made and we certainly hope we will have their support.

The Acting Speaker: Mr. Ruston has moved second reading of Bill 17.

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion the ayes have it.

Motion agreed to.

Bill ordered for committee of the whole House.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Hon. Mr. Gregory: Mr. Speaker, before the House recesses for dinner, can I indicate the business of the House?

Tonight we will continue the budget debate. On Friday we will do the estimates of the Ministry of Government Services. On Monday, May 23, the House will not sit.

On Tuesday, May 24, afternoon and evening, we will do second reading of Bills 14, 35, 36, 37, 38 and 43, standing in the name of the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Ashe), then committee of the whole, if required, on these bills as well as on Bill 3. Then, if there is time, we will have second reading of Bills 4, 5 and 13.

On Thursday, May 26, ballot items standing in the names of Mr. Dean and Mr. Peterson will be called. In the evening, we continue with the budget debate. On Friday, May 27, we continue the estimates of the Ministry of Government Services.

The House recessed at 5:53 p.m.

CONTENTS

Thursday, May 19, 1983

Statement by the ministry

Drea, Hon. F., Minister of Community and Social Services:

Developmentally handicapped people. 867

Oral questions

Davis, Hon. W. G., Premier:

Acid rain, Mr. Rae, Mr. Peterson. 871

Flood plain mapping, Mr. Haggerty. 878

Automotive parts industry, Mr. Cooke. 878

Elgie, Hon. R. G., Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations:

Conversion of rental units, Mr. Ruprecht. 876

Henderson, Hon. L. C., Provincial Secretary for Resources Development:

Indian band agreement, Mr. Van Horne, Mr. J. A. Reed, Mr. Wildman. 870

Government hiring policies, Mr. T. P. Reid, Mr. Wildman. 879

Taylor, Hon. G. W., Solicitor General:

Securicor Investigation and Security Ltd., Mr. Rae, Mr. Wrye. 874

Walker, Hon. G. W., Minister of Industry and Trade:

Automotive parts industry, Mr. Peterson, Mr. Newman, Mr. Cooke, Mr. Wrye. 869

Increased armament production, Mr. R. F. Johnston, Mr. Mackenzie. 877

Petition

Trailer park at Elliot Lake, Ms. Copps, tabled. 881

Report

Standing committee on social development, Mr. Robinson, tabled. 881

First readings

Institute of Management Consultants of Ontario Act, Bill Pr26, Ms. Fish, agreed to. 881

Compensation for Victims of Crime Amendment Act, Bill 44, Mr. Kennedy, agreed to. 881

Human Tissue Gift Amendment Act, Bill 45, Mr. Van Horne, agreed to. 881

Landlord and Tenant Amendment Act, Bill 46, Mr. Boudria, agreed to. 882

Private member's motion

Motion to set aside ordinary business, Mr. Mackenzie, Mr. Wrye, Mr. G. W. Taylor, negatived 882

Private members' public business

Legislative Assembly Amendment Act, Bill 17, Mr. Ruston, Mr. Breaugh, Mr. Gregory, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Di Santo, Mr. J. M. Johnson, second reading, agreed to. 886

Other business

Response to written questions, Mr. Roy. 867

Estimates, Mr. McCague. 867

Response to oral questions, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Nixon. 880

Notice of dissatisfaction, Mr. Speaker.	880
Possible conflict of interest, Mr. Di Santo, Mr. McClellan, Mr. Speaker.	880
Speaker's ruling, Mr. Martel, Mr. Roy, Mr. Speaker.	885
Business of the House, Mr. Gregory.	897
Recess.	897

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Bernier, Hon. L., Minister of Northern Affairs (Kenora PC)
 Boudria, D. (Prescott-Russell L)
 Breau, M. J. (Oshawa NDP)
 Cooke, D. S. (Windsor-Riverside NDP)
 Copps, S. M. (Hamilton Centre L)
 Cousens, D., Deputy Chairman and Acting Speaker (York Centre PC)
 Davis, Hon. W. G., Premier (Brampton PC)
 Di Santo, O. (Downsview NDP)
 Drea, Hon. F., Minister of Community and Social Services (Scarborough Centre PC)
 Elgie, Hon. R. G., Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (York East PC)
 Elston, M. J. (Huron-Bruce L)
 Gregory, Hon. M. E. C., Minister without Portfolio (Mississauga East PC)
 Haggerty, R. (Erie L)
 Henderson, Hon. L. C., Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Lambton PC)
 Johnson, J. M. (Wellington-Dufferin-Peel PC)
 Johnston, R. F. (Scarborough West NDP)
 Kennedy, R. D. (Mississauga South PC)
 Kerrio, V. G. (Niagara Falls L)
 Mackenzie, R. W. (Hamilton East NDP)
 Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
 McCague, Hon. G. R., Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet (Dufferin-Simcoe PC)
 McClellan, R. A. (Bellwoods NDP)
 Newman, B. (Windsor-Walkerville L)
 Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
 Peterson, D. R. (London Centre L)
 Philip, E. T. (Etobicoke NDP)
 Rae, R. K. (York South NDP)
 Reed, J. A. (Halton-Burlington L)
 Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L-Lab.)
 Renwick, J. A. (Riverdale NDP)
 Robinson, A. M. (Scarborough-Ellesmere PC)
 Roy, A. J. (Ottawa East L)
 Ruprecht, T. (Parkdale L)
 Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
 Stokes, J. E. (Lake Nipigon NDP)
 Taylor, Hon. G. W., Solicitor General (Simcoe Centre PC)
 Treleaven, R. L. (Oxford PC)
 Turner, Hon. J. M., Speaker (Peterborough PC)
 Van Horne, R. G. (London North L)
 Walker, Hon. G. W., Minister of Industry and Trade (London South PC)
 Wildman, B. (Algoma NDP)
 Wrye, W. M. (Windsor-Sandwich L)



Hansard

Official Report of Debates

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Third Session, 32nd Parliament

Thursday, May 19, 1983

Evening Sitting

Speaker: Honourable John M. Turner

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

Contents of the proceedings reported in this issue of Hansard appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of the speakers taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is \$15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, Information Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 965-2238.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Thursday, May 19, 1983

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

BUDGET DEBATE (continued)

Resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion that this House approves in general the budgetary policy of the government.

Mr. J. M. Johnson: Mr. Speaker, this is a carryover from the speech this afternoon. I will make some comments on the bill of the member for Essex North (Mr. Ruston).

I am pleased to have the opportunity to participate in the budget debate. This is one of the few occasions when a member is able to discuss matters of provincial interest as they relate to his or her personal point of view.

I wish to mention too at this time that on May 4 the Premier (Mr. Davis) announced his decision not to become a candidate for the leadership of the federal Progressive Conservative Party, a position that is only one step away from being Prime Minister of Canada. As a Canadian I was very disappointed, because I believe the Premier is the outstanding statesman in this country. However, as an Ontarian I was pleased with the Premier's decision.

[Applause]

Mr. J. M. Johnson: Thank you.

Mr. McClellan: Gordon Walker didn't applaud. Boom Boom didn't applaud.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Cousens): Order.

Mr. J. M. Johnson: Canada's loss is Ontario's gain, and I look forward to serving in the Legislature with this Premier for many more years.

I also was extremely pleased with the decision by our Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) not to resign over the so-called leak of his budget. I fully support our Treasurer in this decision, as do all of his caucus colleagues.

Now on to the budget.

Mr. McClellan: You mean the so-called budget.

Mr. J. M. Johnson: Will my friend kindly go away?

I am proud to be a member of a government which has once again delivered a thoughtful,

responsible and responsive budget to the people of this province. I wish first to take a brief look at the major incentives introduced in the budget and then to dwell at some length on the philosophical basis for these initiatives.

The honourable members of the Legislature, especially the honourable members opposite, might well benefit from such a consideration. After all, the principles behind this budget are those that have pervaded our government for the past 40 years. They are also the same principles which have made our province that which it is today.

Let me first speak of the budget and of those whose task it was to design it. In the light of today's uncertain economic climate, there is no doubt the Treasurer has produced the right budget for the times. In preparing this budget, policymakers had to grapple with three conflicting challenges.

First, they were faced with the task of preserving the real gains made over past years. Second, they had to balance future and long-term goals with the real need for short-term relief. Third, they had to meet the challenge of ensuring the interests of all Ontarians as well as responding to the special needs of specific groups in our society. The Treasurer's budget has faced these three challenges squarely and honestly, and has met them.

Real gains have been preserved by sound fiscal policy that has refrained from excessive and costly stimulation. In these times of high unemployment and low capacity utilization, we frequently hear calls for government to spend more and more money. However, this must be resisted lest it lead to the recently broken inflationary cycle starting anew. We must preserve our real gains.

Real gains were made by the government last year in its fight against inflation. This was done in a number of ways. First, public sector cost reduction was passed on to the private sector in the form of lower tax increases. Second, government decreased its demands in the capital market and thus eased pressure on interest rates. Third, the government set an example by signalling an era of lower wage settlements to the private sector.

Finally, the government has preserved real gains by keeping Ontario's actual expenditures and revenues within 0.0 per cent of the original budget estimates tabled last May. As a former businessman, I say this kind of management is remarkable. On a personal note, I ask any of the members of this Legislature if any of them was able to keep his or her budget at less than one per cent off base.

The future wellbeing of this province has been addressed in the budget through the encouragement of investment and productivity improvement in the private sector. Long-term consideration for future needs is also evident in our co-operative stance towards the federal government. We believe we must work in harmony to improve our long-term economic prospects.

Lastly, the best interests of all Ontarians have been ensured by maintaining a fiscal framework that permits the funding of beneficial public programs without imposing an excessive burden of debt on our citizens.

The budget has met the three challenges I mentioned through the following praiseworthy initiatives. The budget holds the increase in government spending below the growth rate of the economy. It keeps a tight rein on the provincial deficit. It fosters provincial-federal co-operation. It stimulates business investment. In this context, I remind the House that the Treasurer has introduced \$335 million worth of tax cuts and incentives, most of which are aimed at small business. Increases in business taxes amount to only \$70 million, and the province will put another \$30 million into the small business development corporation program, providing equity capital to small businesses with fewer than 150 employees.

8:10 p.m.

The budget provides funds for new capital works, manpower training, youth employment and job creation programs. It stimulates consumer spending and raises consumer confidence. The headline in the *Globe and Mail* this morning said that very thing, that consumers are spending more. They have confidence in the economy of the day.

Mr. Cooke: Do you believe everything you read?

Mr. J. M. Johnson: Not in the *Globe*.

As a representative of a farming community, I am pleased to see the introduction of the new beginning farmers program. This program will provide up to five percentage points in interest

subsidy on eligible loans to beginning farmers for a period of five years. Up to 1,000 new farmers can benefit each year. At current interest rates, this program is expected to provide \$9 million in interest subsidies in the first year and \$135 million over five years.

I was also very pleased with the Treasurer's decision to extend for one more year the farm adjustment assistance program, which was scheduled to expire in December 1982.

In 1983 and 1984, \$10 billion will go to fund health and social services, and \$5.5 billion will be spent in education in Ontario. This translates into \$1,000 per citizen for health care and \$1,800 in education for each young person.

The government is committed to maintain and encourage fundamental social programs. Unfortunately, its ability to do so has been seriously hampered by certain federal policies. Members of this House are aware that the federal government has cut its transfer payments to the provinces for health and post-secondary education. These cuts cost Ontario \$288 million last year, and this year it will be \$315 million.

The federal government has compounded the problem by capping the growth of post-secondary education transfer payments. This takes away an additional \$37 million from our revenues this year; so the difficulties facing Ontario in the areas of health and post-secondary education are evident.

The budget deals with financial problems realistically. It faces the fact that money has to be raised to pay for social programs. That is one thing the members opposite always forget.

The guiding principles behind the budget can be summed up simply as belief in the private sector, in the individual and in free enterprise; belief in the people of Ontario.

Mr. Bradley: Like Suncor?

Mr. J. M. Johnson: I have not even thought of mentioning anything about Bryce Mackasey; so do not tempt me.

Mr. Cooke: Let's talk about Bryce.

Mr. J. M. Johnson: Do you want to talk about Bryce?

My government believes the recovery we all anticipate can only be led by the private sector. Only private enterprise can undertake investments and create permanent jobs upon which recovery depends. Government works best when it works hand in hand with the private sector.

It always surprises me how fashionable it is among the opposition to criticize business peo-

ple. Businessmen are accused of being selfish and viewing the world simply as a marketplace. However, it is precisely in times like these when we have narrowly averted a depression that we begin to realize that clearing the economic air depends largely on the ideas and risk-taking of the private sector.

Our society needs entrepreneurs. They create jobs, and they have special insights that can help shape policy aimed at bringing about economic growth and a healthy society. The innovations of the private sector contribute to technical growth and productivity. By the way, very often these fall outside the realm of government grants or even formal research and development. I am talking about the innovations that result from intelligent business thinking. I am talking about the risk-takers in our society who do not wait around for the government to create jobs for them, but who figure out what product or service is needed and find a way to provide it. Thus they create jobs for themselves and for others.

The Treasurer and I both believe that excessive government intervention does not lead to economic recovery. People and businesses are best served when government restricts itself to extending a helping hand. My government has extended a helping hand to the movers and risk-takers in our province. This was demonstrated in last year's budget when the corporate tax on small businesses was eliminated for two years. This has been extended in the current budget to the end of 1984. This year's budget has also included business loss carryovers that apply to small business, farmers and fishermen.

Mr. Cooke: What about Suncor? Do you support Suncor?

The Acting Speaker: The member for Windsor-Riverside (Mr. Cooke) seems to be asking a question, and it is not question period.

Mr. Cooke: What about Suncor, Jack?

The Acting Speaker: The member for Windsor-Riverside should hold his questions until tomorrow, when someone could respond.

Mr. Cooke: But I can't ask him questions.

The Acting Speaker: I am giving a warning to the member for Windsor-Riverside.

Mr. J. M. Johnson: Mr. Speaker, the member for Windsor-Riverside asked a question about Suncor. I have had a long-standing relationship with Suncor. My father sold Sun Oil gasoline for more than 40 years. It is a great company; I am glad the government saw fit to buy a chunk of it.

Maybe some time in the next few years we could sell it.

This is what I call extending a helping hand.

Mr. Cooke: Suncor?

Mr. J. M. Johnson: No, Mr. Bulloch, president of the Canadian Federation of Independent Business, interviewed at CFTO-TV after the recent budget, said:

"The government has sent a very strong message to the private sector and a powerful message to small business. I want to tell Mr. Miller that there are 250,000 small businesses out there that think he is doing a fine job and that the small business emphasis in his budget will stimulate the small business sector and create the jobs he is looking for, and we support him wholeheartedly on the total thrust of his budget."

The members opposite would do well to talk to the small business community and see what it thinks.

The government's faith in our businessmen, whether they be merchants, farmers or fishermen, rests in the belief of the value of free enterprise. My government maintains that basic economic freedom is necessary to give each individual the means and the right to arrange his or her affairs independent of the state. Economic freedom, by the way, is as important for the average person as it is for the corporate executive. It is the small plot of land, the shoe repair shop and the corner store that allow people to live their lives as they see fit.

This is not to say that free enterprise does not allow for a network of services for those in need. It was during the post-war free enterprise period in the western world that the profits and the means were created to provide the most generous benefits and the most equitable distribution of wealth the world has ever seen. This is why I am deeply disturbed by the NDP opposition members, who insist that free enterprise and the profit motive are somehow wrong and destructive to the wellbeing and dignity of our society, as if profits do not accrue to people, as if the opposition could find anywhere in the world, in any period in history, any other system that better shared its profits with its people. That is why those people will always be in the opposition.

Mr. Mackenzie: Are you going to use your storm troopers on us, Jack?

Mr. J. M. Johnson: Mr. Speaker, they are wild over there.

The Acting Speaker: I am having a lot of trouble too.

Mr. J. M. Johnson: To ensure the smooth functioning of the free enterprise system, government has the important role of providing a climate favourable to capital formation and—

The Acting Speaker: I must interrupt the member for Wellington-Dufferin-Peel: a point of privilege, I believe it is.

Mr. Di Santo: Mr. Speaker, my point of privilege is that the honourable member does very well when he is reading the speech. Why does he not stick to the written text? His interjections do not add anything to the—

The Acting Speaker: I must ask the member for Downsview if he has any point worth considering in this House at all?

8:20 p.m.

Mr. J. M. Johnson: Mr. Speaker, the member for Downsview came into the chamber and bothered me earlier in the evening and I did not say anything. Now I would appreciate it if he would just stay silent for about another seven or eight minutes.

As I was saying, to ensure the smooth functioning of the free enterprise system, government has the important role of providing a climate favourable to capital formation and to long-term employment creation. The best way of ensuring this is through responsible fiscal management. Therefore, the government is preventing our borrowing from increasing to the point where our ability to borrow would be impaired. As we know, this is the case in many other jurisdictions.

For example, we are all aware of the problems faced by the federal government. It is hamstrung at every turn. Its deficit is so great that it simply cannot finance new programs. So whether one believes in the value of government spending or not, one can see that a balanced budget provides the means of preserving flexibility when it is needed.

The Treasurer has done that; Mr. Lalonde tried to do it and failed. Our Treasurer has done it without overtaxing Ontarians. As he says, "Fiscal reality is not something government can put aside for another day or another budget." I do not want my grandchildren or my children to pay my debt. We should pay our way in our day.

The members opposite sometimes fail to realize that our high credit rating is more than a status symbol. It is concrete evidence to investors that Ontario is a secure place to put their money. This is precisely what we need. When investors have confidence in a province, then we will ultimately have jobs.

Members may be interested to know that during last year's International Monetary Fund meeting, the Treasurer was told by investors from around the world that Ontario is a good place in which to invest because it is one of the few places in the world where government spending is well managed.

My government is well aware that the adjustment to lower inflation has caused some problems in terms of unemployment. But what are the alternatives? We learned in the 1970s that when nations lived beyond their means through excessive monetary and fiscal policies, they ultimately paid the price in inflation and unemployment. The double-digit inflation many developed nations experienced from 1971 to 1981 sent interest rates skyrocketing, forcing governments to take painful corrective action.

Thus we have learned that over the long term, sustained and real economic growth requires a stable, uninflationary environment. Therefore, establishing the condition for such growth must remain a high government priority.

Good statesmanship involves a vision of one's responsibilities that emphasizes the general interest and long-term good. As a former Prime Minister of Britain, Harold Macmillan, said: "History is apt to judge harshly those who sacrifice tomorrow for today."

As I said earlier, no government will be thanked for mortgaging the future by raising government expenditures now, expecting our children to pay for them at a much higher price—

Mr. Di Santo: How about mortgaging the past?

Interjections.

Mr. J. M. Johnson: Those members should think of their children.

In these hard times, the people of Canada are crying out for leadership and co-operation in consensus building. Our government is prepared to join with Ottawa in any appropriate economic recovery program. We realize we are past the point in our history where we can think or act in isolation.

We are also past the point where the Liberal government in Ottawa can play various groups and governments off against each other and still hope to emerge with meaningful economic renewal. Every government, whether federal or provincial, whether in Quebec or Manitoba, faces similar problems.

We believe the people of Canada have a right to expect their political leaders to confront their

common problems in a constructive manner. To reach constructive solutions, we believe governments must put aside their partisan and jurisdictional disputes and adopt a co-operative attitude that will allow all governments to work together.

I want to stress once more that the initiatives in this budget have been designed for the benefit of all Ontarians. There are some, I know, who feel they have been neglected or penalized in the process. To these individuals or groups, I would like to present a wider perspective that may help in overcoming this tunnel vision. Many individuals and specific groups think more in terms of what is due to them or what they have lost than of how specific initiatives on the part of the government may be helping others with whom they are directly involved.

For example, improved social services inevitably benefit our children, our parents and our grandparents, if indeed these services do not benefit us directly. Assistance to farmers does in the long run benefit consumers. Job creation for young people cannot help producing positive side effects for the fathers, mothers and families of the young people who get these jobs. Measures in support of small business will surely work towards the overall economic wellbeing when one considers the key role played by small business in the creation of jobs in the province.

Revenue-producing initiatives taken to ensure a controlled deficit and at the same time maintain our essential services will produce a more secure economic future for all the citizens of this province. In the words of a noted American economist, Mr. Alfred Kahn, "The problem in our economy is that we have these persistent, well-organized pressures by each individual and group to preserve his or her absolute position, regardless of what happens to the country as a whole."

To achieve and sustain economic recovery it is important that we change this kind of tunnel vision. Today both public and private resources are limited. A responsible government must manage and balance its scarce resources to satisfy many competing priorities and must do what it can to ensure that Ontarians are gainfully employed. It must also fulfil its role as provider of essential services. Through the measures enacted in the budget, our government is acting with responsibility. It is preparing the way for sustained economic recovery while setting the pace for restraint. It has taken a balanced and reasoned approach.

Tonight I would like reaffirm my faith in the

ability of our province to achieve recovery. I believe that Ontario stands to come through these tough times in winning form. Ontario will survive and prosper because it is a well-run province. Under the leadership of the Premier and a cabinet minister like the Treasurer, I am confident that this outstanding management record will be maintained.

Now that I have the undivided attention of the House, there is one other matter of particular concern to me which I would like to comment on; while it is not directly related to this year's budget, it is a matter that has budgetary implications for the province as a whole and the farming community in particular.

Over the years since becoming a member of the Legislature, I have watched with growing dismay the attitude of confrontation that has developed between Ontario Hydro and the farming community. This attitude is all the more surprising when one considers the benefits that Hydro has provided to rural Ontario and its farmers.

I remember well my predecessor John Root's claim that he intended to have rural Ontario electrified as one of his major objectives, and undoubtedly the accomplishment of that objective through the efforts of Ontario Hydro cannot be taken for granted.

It is important that we all recognize the tremendous benefits that have been derived through the expansion of Hydro throughout the rural community of this province and remember that the goals of Ontario Hydro and the farming community are in many respects mutual and compatible. It is therefore extremely disappointing, and often discouraging to me personally, to be a witness to the perception on the part of many farmers that Ontario Hydro is somehow the enemy.

But I am also aware that Ontario Hydro is in large measure responsible for the creation of this perception and that the responsibility for overcoming it will therefore have to be borne by the corporation. I am convinced that Hydro needs to look at its policies more closely. It needs to develop a fresh and more responsive approach to its dealings with the farmers. It needs to view itself as a partner with rural Ontario rather than as an all-powerful benefactor. It needs to adopt a more co-operative and sensitive stance and thereby gain the confidence and friendship of those whom it is attempting to serve.

8:30 p.m.

Only through the implementation of new and progressive methods will Ontario Hydro be restored to its rightful place of esteem in the minds of Ontario's farmers, and the steps to do this should not be delayed.

In this respect, I would like to pay tribute to the immediate past-chairman of Ontario Hydro, Mr. Hugh Macaulay, on his recognition and response to these problems. I hope his successor will follow in his footsteps and continue the promotion of open consultation between Hydro and the farming community.

In this process, I feel members of Parliament also have a role. Indeed, they have an obligation and a responsibility to do their share in fostering a spirit of understanding and co-operation between these two parties and towards resolving any misunderstandings which arise. This will surely be to the benefit of all Ontarians.

Mr. Bradley: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to take part in the budget debate on the 1983-84 fiscal budget and the manner in which the Treasurer of this province has attempted to address the problems that confront Ontario as we move into the mid-1980s.

Mr. Conway: Tell us about the courthouse.

Mr. Bradley: I should diverge slightly as it has its budgetary implications. It would certainly come under the relevance of this particular—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Robinson): I know you will draw everything in as you go along.

Mr. Bradley: Yes, certainly. It is a \$14-million facility in St. Catharines.

The former Speaker of the House is here and he will recall this well. In fact, I have recounted this story many times to all who would listen.

On many occasions, when I first entered this House in 1977, I would use the opportunity in question period to raise the matter of the need for a courthouse facility in St. Catharines. One particular question of note comes to mind. My friend, the member for Erie (Mr. Haggerty) asked a question in the House one day on a proposed tourist booth in Fort Erie. He sat down and I got up on a supplementary question. The member for Lake Nipigon (Mr. Stokes) was in the chair. He took one look at me and said, "Supplementary?" I replied, "Yes." He asked, "On the tourist booth in Fort Erie?" I replied, "Yes." "Try me," he said.

My supplementary question was, "While the Minister of Government Services is looking into this matter, could he report to us on the progress of the courthouse in St. Catharines?" The minister need not have replied because I simply

saw the "No" from the Speaker indicating that was not an acceptable supplementary.

It did bring to mind the situation that took place this morning in my constituency of St. Catharines and the expenditure of \$14 million of taxpayers' money there. I emphasize it is taxpayers' money because sometimes, when the ground-breaking ceremony or the actual opening ceremony takes place, one would think the money had come directly out of the pockets of the provincial ministers who are in attendance.

Mr. Conway: Me and the Premier (Mr. Davis) bring you this cheque.

Mr. Bradley: Or the Premier himself.

The Speaker is an individual who has not been infected by involvement with the cabinet. The people in the cabinet, not necessarily the Speaker, do themselves no credit by the performances that take place at these openings.

I was reticent to cause too much of a scene but I knew when I arrived that first of all, I would not be on the platform. That is not accepted.

Mr. Stokes: Were you invited?

Mr. Bradley: I did get the official invitation on Monday of this week. I had word of it previous to that, though it was nothing official. The official invitation arrived on Monday.

Some of my Tory friends in the city indicated to me that they suspected I would not be on the platform. I said, "That is par for the course. I was here when the Premier came down to break the ground in whatever way he did it."

Mr. Nixon: He broke what?

Mr. Bradley: He made some passing reference to the local member. Then I looked at the program. Of course, the program lists all the people who are going to speak, all of them except one, the Chief Justice, who does not have a political affiliation, as I recall.

There was no official recognition in the program and no room on the platform for the local member for the city of St. Catharines where the courthouse is being built. It is not a matter of ego, I suggest, or even necessarily a matter of protocol. It is a matter of common courtesy.

I have seen this happen before at both the federal and the provincial level. I have seen it happen to the federal opposition as well, and I disapprove of it no matter where it happens and no matter what the jurisdiction. If only the members on the far side—I am not particularly pointing to the ones who are here this evening—

would recognize it, it really reflects badly upon those on the government side when this happens.

Having looked at the program I had to figure out where I could crash the platform; it was well fortified. It had the chairs at the very end and it was going to be difficult to get on that blue platform and bring a few words of greeting and a few points to the ministers who were assembled there.

Mr. Conway: Were the many government limousines drawn around in a circle?

The Acting Speaker: I thought you were telling the story rather well on your own. Perhaps if your colleagues would allow you to continue without their help, we could keep going.

Mr. Bradley: That portion of Church Street was completely blocked off permitting the limousines to be driven up in front of the new courthouse building. I figured there must be some way that I could break into the program in a very diplomatic way. After it said the last person, the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Elgie), would speak—

Mr. Roy: Was he there too? What was he doing there?

Mr. Bradley: I then decided that I would hop up on the side and just move to the microphone. Unless security guards were there to tow me away, which they were not, I would have an opportunity to bring greetings to our visitors from outside the provincial constituency of St. Catharines, to outline the role of a member of the opposition in the construction of this building and to share the credit with those in the community who had worked so hard to persuade the provincial government of the need for a courthouse.

I must say we went through several elections where I was promised. The interesting thing is during the last campaign, the pitch of those on the far side was, "You have to have a government member to get something." We had government members for years and it was not until an opposition member was elected in the constituency that the courthouse was built.

I suggested to a few of my friends of Conservative persuasion, who nodded in acquiescence—today, if they want their Queen's counsel, they are not going to admit this, but those who already have their Queen's counsels are prepared to admit it—that there had just been some little contribution made by an opposition member in St. Catharines, who brought the matter up

in the House during the question period and embarrassed the government over it in committee.

I want to commend the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry) who gave me a sympathetic ear on many occasions. I also want to commend the member for Brock (Mr. Welch) who no doubt was, as I indicated today on the platform, putting a pretty sharp elbow into the Attorney General and the Minister of Government Services (Mr. Wiseman) in attempting to persuade, as I was, the right powers in government that we needed this particular courthouse.

Mr. Conway: Jim Bradley drinks real water.

Mr. Bradley: Anyway, it was quite a ceremony. I did get my opportunity to speak there. It was not scheduled, but I was nevertheless there and the democratic process was carried out. I am pleased the taxpayers of Ontario have been provided with this very much needed facility.

I indicated to the Attorney General on many occasions that I thought if I knocked on 10 or 20 doors in St. Catharines, the people would not say that was the number one thing we needed, but those who are familiar with the circumstances certainly recognize the need for a courthouse facility in Niagara North. I am pleased that we have it today and I will be certain to include it in my next constituency brochure.

Mr. Roy: Well done, Jimmy. Well done.

8:40 p.m.

Mr. Bradley: I had not intended to diverge on this, but the arrival in the House of the member for Ottawa East (Mr. Roy) and the member for Renfrew North (Mr. Conway), prompted me to become involved in that particular issue. I did want to look specifically at the provisions of the budget, and how they affect the people of Ontario.

If one were to look at the overall budget, I guess the best words for it are "stand pat" or "somewhat lacklustre" budget. However, a budget that extracts from the people of Ontario millions of dollars more than it gives back is certainly not a budget that could be accurately described as "stand pat."

It is a little bit of what could be termed a shell game. The government shows one thing at one time by apparently assisting people through job creation, and takes money away with the other hand.

We have some interesting taxes. One, of course, is the Ontario health insurance plan premium. That is an unfair tax. The government

can call it what they want, it is still a tax. Let me explain one example of how it is unfair.

When the OHIP premium officially goes up, I suppose those of us who are members of the Legislature will automatically have the government pay our full OHIP premium. So it is no skin off our necks, so to speak. Yet, my constituency office secretary, who does not have these benefits and must pay her own OHIP premium is in a position of being taxed an additional amount of money that will come directly out of her pocket.

Therefore, the tax is inequitable. It has been pointed out many times in this House that the premium assistance provision, which the government brags about in this House but does not talk about much in the hinterlands, has not been increased in any significant manner in recent years so more people would qualify for it. That would certainly alleviate some of that problem.

We also had an interim social services maintenance tax. I am highly offended, as I think many members of this House are, with the terminology used. It somehow suggests that the poor, the disadvantaged of Ontario, are to blame for the amount of money that must be extracted from taxpayers. Better, as my colleague the member for Prescott-Russell (Mr. Boudria) said in his remarks in the House, that it be called the Suncor tax, to pay the \$650 million that is being invested in Suncor.

I always thought the socialist party was the party immediately to our left, a party that certainly does not decide that it is not socialist, is above board and says that is a platform on which to run. That is fine, and yet across the floor we have the party that appears to be, or likes to appear to be, the party of free enterprise, which suggests that an expenditure of \$650 million on an oil company for Ontario is a reasonable expenditure.

I would suggest this tax could be called the advertising tax. On many occasions I have been critical of this government, for in the past two years it has spent some \$40 million in each of those years on advertising campaigns.

I am not one of those people who thinks all the good people are over here and all the bad people are over there, and everybody on the other side is automatically acquiescent to what is done. I think there are a number of people over there who probably have enough of a conscience to know that for governments to spend the kind of money they do—and I say “governments,” plural, but we are elected to this provincial Legislature, so I will concentrate on the government opposite—for them to spend

\$40 million in a year when they are preaching restraint to everyone else, in a year when money could be used in other areas, is certainly not something that can be easily defended. I suggest, therefore, the social services maintenance tax can be called the advertising tax.

Certainly, we do not need to spend in that manner the money used to tell us, “Life is good, Ontario, preserve it, conserve it;” or that our streams are nice and clean or something of that nature. There are reasonable areas of expenditure in terms of providing information.

An example of a reasonable expenditure is the Ministry of Health's advertising campaign that indicates to the people of Ontario that all children must be immunized. Another is the government's advertising program that shows its child restraint program. They said: “This is the new law, this is how it must be enforced.”

That is a reasonable expenditure, and we on this side will not quarrel with such an expenditure. But when the money is squandered, as it is in so many cases, on self congratulations on the other side, that is when we justifiably object.

We could call it the Minaki Lodge tax. The total amount of money associated with this project is some \$45 million.

I see the member for Sudbury (Mr. Gordon) is here tonight. I want Hansard to record that he is here. I know his community has been particularly hard hit by unemployment. He and the people in his community are subject to the ups and downs of the economy. When the economy is down it particularly hits those of us who represent automotive centres and those who represent mining centres. Certainly, I do not expect him to agree with me tonight, he is a member of the government side, but I think he could think of 45 different projects at \$1 million each that would be of more benefit to his community and the surrounding area than Minaki Lodge was.

It is not that we object. What concerns me is when certain northern members say to us, “You are against the north and that is why you are against that.” That is not the case. If the member for Sudbury were to stand in this House and suggest a number of areas in which we could spend money productively on his and other areas I would be very supportive of that, because I think the north deserves, and certainly needs, that kind of assistance.

Over the years it has provided us with the raw materials that we have required. Some of the toughest jobs we have in this province are in northern Ontario. They deserve a return up

there. Those of us who reside in the south, where most of the economic action and benefit from the raw materials of the north are realized would be pleased to see that kind of expenditure.

That tax could be called the Minaki Lodge tax or it could be called the land banking tax. How much money did the government spend on land banking? Who knows what was spent?

Mr. Boudria: It was \$570 million.

Mr. Bradley: I cannot help thinking, once again, there are many members over there who do not believe in land banking. There are some specific occasions when land banking is probably useful. But it seems to me that in the three major examples that were given, land banking was not a particularly good investment of the taxpayers' money. We have a few houses in Townsend, a municipality that was supposed to be booming by now. In Pickering we had a large expenditure of money, and in Edwardsburgh we had a large expenditure of money. In all three areas the money could have been used more productively to produce job opportunities and the kind of economic activity that brings forward those job opportunities.

We also had the jet. I know the jet has been shot down. I recall a resolution I brought forward in the House on April 8, 1982. We talked about the jet. There is one person I wanted to commend on that occasion. He is a person from the north. We had the governor of the north, as he is affectionately known by those of us in the opposition, the member for Kenora (Mr. Bernier), who indicated clearly to us, along with the member for Cochrane South (Mr. Pope), that those of us who opposed the jet were opposing northern Ontario. What we were opposing, of course, was the provision of a luxurious Challenger jet for the comfort and convenience of the Premier (Mr. Davis), the cabinet and other senior government officials.

There were two issues concerning which the government ran into flak with its own people. One was Suncor. I talked to a lot of Tories in my community and they told me to go after the people on the other side, and tell them what they think of this. People laughed at the jet incident. They said, "Oh, it is \$11 million and in a big budget that is not much." That did more damage to the people on that side of the House than almost anything last year in terms of a proposed expenditure. Finally, the government had to relent and change the jet magically into two water bombers, which I am convinced will be of far more use to northern Ontario than the jet.

That kind of expenditure is like waving a red flag in front of people in communities with high unemployment. The member for Sudbury experienced unemployment of over 31 per cent on one occasion. It has been about 22 per cent in our area. That kind of expenditure is fodder for the opposition, sure, but it is damaging for the government. I hope the people in that caucus will remind the Premier, will challenge the Premier and the senior cabinet ministers when such expenditures are made.

Let me give an example in my own area. I was pleased to see \$14 million spent on the administration of justice building. It was very much needed. It helped our construction industry. There were two components. First, it was good for the economy in the jobs it produced and, second, it was a needed facility. Let me contrast that with the creation of that government on the opposite side.

It was the former member for Chatham-Kent who was primarily responsible for regional government. Guess what we are going to be opening on June 4, June 5, or June 6, in St. Catharines—not in St. Catharines—

8:50 p.m.

Mr. Boudria: Could it be regional headquarters?

Mr. Bradley: It is a regional headquarters. We have to have a focus for regional government. It is called a focus; we must have a focus. What do we have? We have a palace on the brow of the escarpment. Several million dollars in cost at a time when the people in our community are being asked to restrain themselves and at a time when the municipal taxes are increasing. If one wants to sell regional government, one does not run out and build a brand new headquarters. It is going to be nice for the staff. It is going to be nice for councillors. They are all new chairs, by the way. They cannot move the chairs from the other regional council into the new regional council; they have to have new chairs.

Mr. Conway: Do you think the Minister of Education (Miss Stephenson) knows about this?

Mr. Bradley: I am wondering if the Minister of Education would know about this, because she was particularly critical of people in the field of education, but did not use the same daggers on those who are in regional government.

Many people are good councillors. I have many friends who sit on regional council and some of the senior staff and other staff are people who are very competent. This is not what we are challenging; surely this kind of unnecessary expenditure of the taxpayers' dol-

lars is like waving a red flag at a bull, and the taxpayers in this case are very displeased with that kind of expenditure.

Once again, I mention that I listened to speaker after speaker on the other side tell us that this government knows how to manage the economy. My friend the member for Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. McCague) indicated that he was pleased to see the way the provincial Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) had managed the economy. We have a deficit of only \$2.7 billion. I remind that member, and others in this House, that since the present Premier of this province came to office, this province has had a deficit every year.

That would not be so bad if that is the way they want to finance things and they were above board and said that was the way they want to finance them, but they go about this province talking about fiscal responsibility and they squander that much money and they run deficits every year. Previous to the budget, I said it would be understandable, if we, in both opposition parties, would not be jumping all over the Treasurer if he were to have a deficit which was substantially higher than a lot of people would like to see it in normal economic times.

Indeed, there was not a good deal of that kind of criticism except in the context of what we say are the unnecessary expenditures that are in this budget.

Mr. Conway: The member for Prince Edward-Lennox (Mr. J. A. Taylor) made a few hot speeches.

Mr. Bradley: I am not always on the same wavelength in terms of personal philosophy as the member for Prince Edward-Lennox, but I must say he is a person on the opposite side who often speaks his mind. I have sat in committees with him and he is a refreshing individual to have in the committees. I cannot misquote this, because he once corrected me on how it happened, about being "mugged in the corridors of power." He will read this in Hansard because I know he reads every word in Hansard and tell me that I am wrong again about "mugged in the corridors of power" or words to that effect.

There is a person who has been through the Ministry of Energy, who had to deal with Ontario Hydro. There was not a better person on our resources development committee when we dealt with the Pickering Project than the member for Prince Edward-Lennox. I must say he did a top-notch job because he has been through it. He knows how one gets snowed by

some of the stuff that comes from certain government agencies.

He was prepared to stand up against that. He has paid the penalty. He is no longer a member of that cabinet. Still, in committee, that gentleman is prepared to challenge even his own government; and I admire that because there are many who are not prepared to do so, either because they feel they are upwardly mobile, and if one were to challenge the government it would be downwardly mobile, or they are simply prepared to be trained seals. There are too many elected to this Legislature on the government side to be simply trained seals.

Mr. Conway: What about the member for St. George (Ms. Fish)? Is she a trained seal?

Mr. Bradley: I well remember when the member for St. George was a member of the New Democratic Party, but I know the Speaker does not want me to get off the budget.

The Acting Speaker: You are absolutely right as usual.

Mr. Bradley: I will not get into that. I will not be moved in a different direction. I simply want to say that for years this government has lived on a reputation of being a great financial management group. It is my contention that they have not been nearly as great as they would like to pretend to the people of this province.

Nevertheless, as the Premier has said on many occasions, it is not the substance that counts, it is not the reality that counts, it is the perception that counts; and the people on the opposite side have been very successful in creating a perception of fiscal responsibility and sound management of the economy.

I want to move to a couple of other areas. I want to talk about taxes, for instance. I was speaking on the interim social services maintenance tax; which I think is a backward step, but it is taken. There is a tax on tobacco and alcohol, and we in the opposition cannot complain about that. It is a tax on sin, supposedly. What it really means, of course, is that those who are wealthier are able to pay more for the sin, and the sin does not hurt them as much financially as it does others. I cannot dwell for a long time on that. It is the kind of tax members on the opposite side are able to get away with.

I get annoyed when I hear people say at income tax time, "Well, I am sending Trudeau this much money." When I filled out my income tax this year, I almost forgot to put in the

provincial tax. It looked pretty good until I had to take 48 per cent of the meagre sum of money that I was paying in tax, and I recognized once again that the provincial government is extracting from this economy a considerable amount in income tax. Not many people know that.

This brings me to another topic related to this budget. I heard the Treasurer—and some of us heard this in the public accounts committee—talk about the fact that the provincial government might give consideration to collecting its own taxes because they are not entirely happy with the rules and regulations affecting the federal tax.

Let me assure members that this will simply never happen, and it will never happen for one reason: not because of the cost of administration, not for any reason they can dream up other than the fact they would have to take the heat. The people of Ontario would know they are paying their taxes in droves to this government as well as to the government in Ottawa. It is fine to let the government in Ottawa take the flak; then, when expenditures are being put forward that are going to be beneficial to the province, those on the opposite side will be first in line to take the credit.

We cannot forget two other taxes. One is the extension of the retail sales tax that happened last year. Everybody forgot about last year's budget, when this government moved into new areas of taxing people on essential items. When they put a sales tax on nonessential items or luxury items it is more acceptable than when you have it on essential items, but I guess the Treasurer recognized that when the economy was well down, people were not buying the non-necessities to the extent they had bought them in the past; the only place to derive the kind of revenues he needed was in the essential items, and therefore he extended it. I was hopeful he would have removed those taxes again and reinstated the exemptions, but of course he has not. We will have to wait for the election year for that to happen.

I got a call at my constituency office again today, from someone who asked: "To whom do we complain about the gas tax? Is that the federal government?" The federal government and the province of Alberta certainly participated in discussions about this and the government of Saskatchewan was involved in some discussions. They are the oil-producing provinces, so they have a certain vested interest in higher prices.

But we must not forget for one moment that here in Ontario—and this is a subject near and dear to the member for Lake Nipigon (Mr. Stokes), who knows his people pay even more than most people in the southerly parts of Ontario—20 per cent is being taken on top of the established price. Of course, the people on the opposite side then benefit from inflation, because the higher the price goes the more revenues are derived and go into the pockets of the provincial government.

I would like to see them go back to the old fixed tax on gasoline. I recognize they need revenues; I am not unfair enough to say they can remove all taxes. They have programs they have to support, and therefore, I am prepared to say I know there are going to be taxes on gasoline. But let us go back to the fixed sum so when they want to raise it, if they do not think sufficient revenues are coming forward, they have to come back to this Legislature and make their case to the members of the Legislature and to the public rather than simply slip it in through as an ad valorem tax, which automatically increases when the price of the gasoline increases. Those are some comments I have on taxes.

9 p.m.

There is another area I wanted to touch on which I think is of particular importance to all of us. We have the veiled threat by the Treasurer of the removal of the property tax credit. It has, of course, served in the last several years to alleviate at least part of the burden on the municipal taxpayer. It certainly has not eliminated that by any means. It has not reduced it as much as we would like, but at least part of that burden on the municipal taxpayer has been alleviated through the implementation of the property tax credit.

Now we have the Treasurer saying: "Watch out. We may be taking it away." I hope the members opposite, as well as those on this side, will continue to remind the Treasurer of the need for this since he is underfunding municipalities and boards of education, thereby forcing them to raise their municipal taxes to a greater extent.

I also want to dwell on some areas I think are necessary expenditures, but before I do so I would like to point out to the people of this province, all who are going to read Hansard, where the provincial government gets some of

its money. Everybody thinks there are perhaps one or two provincial taxes.

Let me read into the record where some of these sources of revenue are. Under taxation revenue: personal income tax, \$4,928,000,000; corporation income tax, \$1,322,000,000; capital tax, \$329 million; insurance premiums tax, \$118 million; mining profits tax, \$56 million; retail sales tax, \$2,853,000,000; gasoline tax, \$759 million; motor vehicle fuel tax, \$172 million; reciprocal taxation, \$48 million; tobacco tax, \$345 million; land transfer tax, \$129 million; racetracks tax, \$59 million; other taxation, \$18 million.

Then we get into other revenue: Ontario health insurance plan premiums, \$1,179,000,000; Liquor Control Board of Ontario profits, \$502 million; interest on investments, \$623 million; vehicle registration fees, \$296 million; Liquor Licence Board of Ontario fees, licences and permits, \$170 million; other fees and licences, \$179 million; Ontario lottery profits, \$137 million; fines and penalties, \$76 million; royalties, \$67 million; utility service charges, \$73 million; sales and rentals, \$64 million; and miscellaneous, \$122 million.

What I want to point out is the many taxes and sources of revenue that are involved with the provincial government. This is so the people of this province happen to know. I know they will all be reading Hansard and will want to know that.

Let us look at what this budget should have produced; then let us look at what this budget did produce for us. I guess what we were looking for, and I think all of us in the opposition probably place this in the first category, was some job creation. There may be some quarrel as to the specific way of having that job creation and I am pleased some money was placed in job creation. I think it is inadequate, but some of the money was put there and I want to be fair enough to give credit that there was some allocation of funds in that area.

My friend the member for Ottawa East (Mr. Roy) listed a number of people this afternoon, or at least had a release that talked about a number of people who do have jobs in Ontario. There are many in my community who do not, people who have been out of work for months in the automotive industry, in the construction industry and so on. None of them were as fortunate as the former cabinet minister, John Yaremko, who gets \$51,000 as the chairman of the Liquor License Appeal Tribunal; or Marvin Shore who was once a member of this Legisla-

ture who was given a \$30,000 a year job with the Ministry of Industry and Tourism following his defeat in 1977; or Omer Déslauriers, the candidate in Ottawa East, who gets a \$52,000 salary and \$25,000 in perks as Ontario's Agent General in Brussels.

Morley Rosenberg gets \$60,100 on an Ontario Municipal Board appointment. Bryan Hocking, the 1981 candidate for Renfrew North, has a three-year term on the Regional Development Corp. John Howard White, the former Ontario cabinet minister, was appointed president of the Ontario Heritage Foundation. William Clark, active in the campaign of the member for Durham East (Mr. Cureatz), and a home owner with no experience in rent review, in 1981 was appointed to the Ontario Residential Tenancy Commission at \$35,000.

A large number of people are listed here. I do not want to go through all the names. These are some of the people who did not have a job. I did not want to mention some people because then I would have to talk about the person who gave a recommendation for Morley. There are some people who wrote recommendations for Morley who today may be mighty sorry they wrote them. In fact, one of those people has had to move from the first row to the second row now that he is no longer leader of the New Democratic Party. I do not want to get into those things because they can be embarrassing.

What we need in this province is some job creation measures that will put people back to work, particularly older people who have been victims of plant closings. All of us in our communities have had those people. I feel sorry for the people who are 49, 50, 51 or 52 who are out of a job and have to head in another direction. It is very difficult to get employment at that age in another job that might be available in a plant.

First, we have high unemployment and that is difficult enough. People in that age bracket find that, by and large, companies are not willing to hire them unless they are extremely skilled or have some very significant contribution to make in the work place. The average individual does not have that chance. It is pretty heart-rending to hear their stories when these people come into our constituency offices. They are down and out and simply unable to get another job. They are people we should be addressing ourselves to in this Legislature.

A second and growing group is composed of the young people who come out of our educational institutions hoping and expecting there

might be good job opportunities in the province that used to call itself the "province of opportunity," but whose slogan now says, "Keep it beautiful," or what is the new slogan?

Mr. Boudria: "Yours to discover."

Mr. Bradley: One thing the young people are discovering in this province is that job opportunities are not there.

This is not to suggest the government in itself can produce all the job opportunities. It can produce some of them, but it certainly cannot produce the majority of them. They must come from the private sector. That means we need a budget that is going to stimulate the economy; not a rush of funds that will produce inflation, not extremely heavy expenditures, but a significant amount of money, certainly more than was infused into the economy by the Treasurer to create that kind of economic activity. There should be some cuts in taxes to put more money back into the hands of the consumer so the consumer can get back on track and produce the kind of economic activity that will produce jobs.

Another area where there is a great opportunity for job creation is the environment. There is nobody in this House who is not concerned about the environment. There are some who would place it in a different category in terms of priorities. Some say jobs first and the environment second. I have never accepted that we have to sacrifice the environment for job creation. The two go hand in hand. We have a unique opportunity at a time of high unemployment to establish ourselves in areas of technology that can be particularly useful to other jurisdictions by working on the environment, by cleaning up the environment, by producing pollution abatement equipment and so on.

Those of us who represent the Niagara Peninsula ridings are extremely concerned, as I know all members of the House are. Certainly the member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Kerrio) and others on many occasions have raised the issue of the state of the Niagara River and the money that can be expended on it. Some say, "It is the Americans' fault." Certainly the United States, at least a portion of New York state, specifically that area in close proximity to Niagara Falls, New York, and right along to Buffalo, has a lot to answer for to the people of the world.

9:10 p.m.

If we are to make the best possible case, we on our side have to be squeaky clean. We have to

enforce our regulations on our side and, most particularly, we have to make a commitment of funds to clean up the environment.

The Minister of the Environment (Mr. Norton) would get applause from over here if he stood in the House tomorrow and said we are now prepared to fund secondary sewage treatment at the Fort Erie plant, secondary sewage treatment at the Niagara Falls pollution abatement plant; maybe even tertiary treatment if necessary, with activated carbon charcoal filtration being put in at the plant on an experimental basis, let us say at the Niagara Falls filtration plant; or a comparable system, not necessarily activated carbon filtration, if there is a comparable and less expensive system.

I would be the first who would be prepared to tell the news media. I would say it is very late in the day to do it, but I would be delighted at the fact he would make an expenditure of that kind of dollars on cleaning up the environment; because it does two things.

First, it cleans up the environment but, second, it gives us a far better case when we go to the Americans on cleaning up their environment if we ourselves, to use the terminology, are squeaky clean. I urge the Minister of the Environment and his colleagues to take that kind of action and accept the credit because the credit would be due to the government if they were to do that.

I also urge the government to meet its responsibility in terms of—

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege: As the only former leader of any party present in the Legislature who has moved to the second row, I wish to correct the record on a statement that was made by the honourable member just before I came in.

I regret to say that, yes, I did recommend Morley Rosenberg as a Queen's counsel. It was not something I was in the custom of doing but at his request I did so. It was certainly long before he got into his conversion to the Progressive Conservative Party. However, I did not at any time recommend his appointment to the Ontario Municipal Board, particularly after he had broken ranks with the New Democratic Party and become a Conservative.

Mr. Roy: He got on the OMB because he had a QC.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Cousens): We are on the budget.

Mr. Bradley: Mr. Speaker, I certainly apologize to the member for Ottawa Centre (Mr.

Cassidy) if I in any way have embarrassed him through that. I accept entirely what he has said as being accurate. I do not know whether I can agree with the member for Ottawa East that he got the QC and that made him eligible for the OMB—

Mr. Roy: He did not get on there because he was a Tory.

The Acting Speaker: The honourable member would do us all a favour by discussing the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. Bradley: I have always had a great admiration for the member for Ottawa Centre and I accept what he says entirely on this particular issue. I want to go on to another issue of importance and that is the issue of education in this province and the amount of funding that is provided to education.

I sat in on a speech which was delivered by the Minister of Education (Miss Stephenson) to the Advertising and Sales Club of Toronto.

Mr. Conway: A bristler.

Mr. Bradley: It was a bristler to be sure. It was the right audience for peripheral teacher-baiting and public servant-baiting and it drew applause in certain areas. It conjured up the kind of concerns we often hear from members of the ad and sales club or other groups about the expenditures in the field of education.

Mr. Conway: It sounded like an attack on Bill Davis.

Mr. Bradley: Of course, in the policy she has announced in recent years, the minister has completely repudiated the Premier's policies as Minister of Education, but that is not directly related to the budget and I want to deal more with the budget.

What is happening in this province is that one has the Minister of Education who I happen to have a great deal of respect for, I like the Minister of Education. She has been kind to me on many public occasions and in the House is very quick-witted and combative, to say the least.

She and the government are starting to set out to pick out the enemies in the municipalities and the boards of education. They are saying this year, "Boards of education get a 5.73 per cent increase." That does not always translate into a 5.73 per cent increase. It sometimes translates, as in the case of my own board of education, the Lincoln County Board of Education, into probably less than one per cent increase.

Yet they must meet expenditures and there are one or two things that can be done. First,

services and programs must be cut and, as the minister herself has conceded, the public is demanding more and more from the education system in this province so that is not a viable option.

The second option is to raise municipal taxes. As anybody in this House knows, if there is one tax that is regressive it is the municipal property tax. A person in my riding who has been unemployed for seven months gets a tax bill that says, "You owe \$1,000 as a result of the assessment on your house and our mill rate." That person who has been unemployed for seven months still has to pay \$1,000, the same as the employed person who might be making \$30,000, \$35,000 or \$40,000 and is quite able to meet that commitment.

The property tax at all times, but particularly in difficult economic times, does not take into account a person's ability to pay. It is regressive, yet the government is forcing municipalities and boards of education to raise those taxes.

The government is mandating programs. The minister says: "Why do you not cut back on education? The local boards know where they can cut." Yet the province mandates programs. It says: "We have Bill 82. You must implement Bill 82." All members of this House agree Bill 82 is a very progressive step. We commended the government on it. We commended the government for accepting our suggestions and modifications on it. It is a model bill for many other jurisdictions.

To be an effective piece of legislation, the bill requires the funding to go with it and that is what local boards of education are concerned about. They are concerned that, while there may be some new and additional funding coming forward to meet the obligations of special education, at the same time money will be taken away from other areas of education and the local taxpayer will be forced to assume a greater portion of the load.

It is interesting to note that in 1975, the Ontario government provided on an average across this province over 60 per cent of the cost of education; that is, the boards of education and the provincial government. Today, according to a figure someone has given me, that has fallen and less than 49 per cent of the cost of education is now assumed by the province. While the dollar figure is going up because inflation is going up, the portion assumed by the provincial government is well down. That figure should go up substantially and I think 60 per

cent is a reasonable figure to be aiming at in the context of 1983. We look for that assistance.

I recall the announcement on French-language education was made before the Premier had finished his count of delegates. Perhaps at that time he was thinking he might be able to top the choice of the Minister of Correctional Services (Mr. Leluk), whose choice is Michael Wilson, fine gentleman that he is. There was a time when the Premier thought his vote total would be somewhat higher and the announcement was made of the extension of French-language education to every francophone student in the province.

I know the member for Hastings-Peterborough (Mr. Pollock) publicly expressed his great concern about this particular announcement on the part of the Minister of Education.

I do not want to dwell on the policy aspect as much as on one other thing. My friend the member for Renfrew North (Mr. Conway) pointed out something very significant to me when the announcement was made. He was listening to it on the radio. He said, "There was something missing in that announcement." I said, "I think they said this, this and this about it." He said, "No, something was missing."

Then it dawned on me no announcement had been made as to how this would be funded. The minister simply said it would cost \$1 million more or something like that and it could be easily funded. The announcement was made but there was no corresponding announcement of funding from the provincial government.

It would be much more acceptable to the member for Hastings-Peterborough and others if the minister were to announce that the provincial government would be funding this program. That is the kind of thing we are looking for.

Bill 82 and francophone education are two examples of mandated programs, but the provincial government is not providing the necessary funding. I urge the minister that, rather than attempting to stir up resentment about the salaries of people who are involved in the education system, to provide the necessary funding to ensure our system meets the needs of the 1980s. As she aptly pointed out in her speech, those needs are substantially different than they were in the 1960s and 1970s, and certainly than they were at the time when the member for Renfrew North went to school.

Mr. Conway: It was a long time ago.

9:20 p.m.

Mr. Bradley: I also want to touch briefly on the area of health because I am one of these people who believes that, when the provincial government spends money on health, it is spending money in an area where it is going to receive a lot of support.

The hospitals in this province have certainly indicated their needs. I am not suggesting and I think it would be foolish for us to suggest on this side, or anywhere, that there is an unlimited amount of money available to spend. But if we were to talk to the people of the various constituencies in this province, they would agree that an expenditure of funds on health care is a good expenditure.

I think of my own jurisdiction of St. Catharines and St. Catharines General Hospital. I attended along with the member for Brock (Mr. Welch) who was very gracious in many of the comments he made on that evening. He included me in his comments on the need for a computerized axial tomography scanner and the kind of support we could expect in the community. The interesting thing is that \$1.65 million will be paid for the CAT scanner by the people of our community, not the taxpayers of Ontario. I think the provincial government will provide \$150,000 a year for the operating costs, which will not cover the operating costs.

I think we would all agree the CAT scanner is an essential item. Health care has a very high priority with everyone. To have people have to wait four months to get into it when they perhaps would benefit from the diagnosis that is available from the CAT scanner at an earlier point is unacceptable. I would certainly not be critical of those kinds of expenditures.

In my own constituency, we have a dire need at the St. Catharines General Hospital for replacement of a particular wing. It is called the McSloy wing and it was built in 1911. If members were to travel through that wing they would be ashamed. When I hear the Minister of Health (Mr. Grossman) say we have a health care system in this province second to none, I would like to drag him through the McSloy wing in the general hospital in St. Catharines to see its state, to see the plaster falling off the walls and the paint peeling off the walls. It is a dismal situation. It is like sending people to a dungeon. What it has essentially turned into is a chronic care wing of the hospital.

The only thing which makes it at all acceptable is the kind of care that is given by a loving and concerned staff there. If one looks at the way the staff treats the chronic patients, one can

only be very proud of those people and have a great admiration for them. That is the only thing that makes it livable in the McSloy wing.

What they have asked for some time is funds to replace that particular wing because the Community wing looks very good, the Mills wing looks great. We have many good facilities at the Hotel Dieu and the Shaver Hospital, but the one which stands out as being in need of an expenditure of provincial government funds is the McSloy wing.

I appeal to the Minister of Health and others on that side to provide the kind of funding which would restore it. I know he will be reading the Hansard and responding rapidly to my plea. I think the member for Oshawa (Mr. Breaugh) wishes to speak tonight and I do want to reserve some time for him.

Mr. Kerrio: Do we have to listen to him twice in one day?

Mr. Bradley: He is certainly worth listening to because—

Mr. Breaugh: You have not listened to me yet, Vince. Why start now?

Mr. Bradley: Where was I? The auto industry is another area of interest to the members from Windsor, Oakville, the Niagara Peninsula and Oshawa. They are all concerned about the future of the automobile industry. I think most of us know that, at least in the case of General Motors and perhaps some of the other plants, we are back to work to a large extent. Our people are back. They are earning a good deal of money now because there is overtime. There is at least a minor boomlet at least in the automotive industry.

Our concern is with the long-term future of the automotive industry and those industries which are reliant upon a healthy automotive industry. There have been many discussions. Once again today, the matter of Canadian content was raised in the House and we had the report that was produced. Mr. Lumley, the Minister of Industry and Regional Expansion, released the report, *An Automotive Strategy for Canada*.

There were some well-known people on that, such as the president of General Motors; Sam Gindin, who is the director of research for the United Automobile Workers in Canada, a person very knowledgeable in the field of the automotive industry; Mr. Harrigan, president of the Ford Motor Company; Mr. Sedgwick from Magna International Inc.; Mr. Dykes, from the Motor Vehicle Manufacturers' Association; Mr.

Closs, president of Chrysler Canada; as well as two people who have had a high profile on this issue, Pat Lavelle, president of the Automotive Parts Manufacturers' Association of Canada, and Robert White, who is the director for Canada of the UAW.

I think when these people—and some of them on many occasions, serve on the union side or the management side in negotiations—delved into the issue of the future of the automotive industry and put aside those differences for a moment, they came up with a report which I think offers some good opportunities for us in the future. I do not believe those of us who represent the constituencies are being parochial—

Mr. Cooke: Is Bob White one of those union bosses the member for Ottawa East refers to all the time.

Mr. Bradley: Was he in Florida when the member was there for a month? He was not there; I just wondered. Anyway, I will not be diverted.

I happen to have a good deal of respect for Robert White, the head of the United Automobile Workers in Canada. I know many people in this caucus have a good deal of respect for him, and for the others on the task force. There is no question those of us who represent constituencies which have a large number of automobile workers recognize, perhaps more than anyone else, the need for Canadian content in our automobiles. We—

Mr. Cassidy: You respect the unions if there are enough of them to count. Is that right?

Mr. Bradley: I think they have made a case very well. I think there are those who accuse the members from Windsor, the member for Oshawa (Mr. Breaugh), the member for St. Catharines and so on of being parochial, of thinking only of their communities. We recognize that while the automobile industry is important to our communities, it is also of great importance to this province and this country in terms of economic viability. All of us should therefore recognize, no matter where we live, the importance of Canadian content.

Mr. Cassidy: You take this position as an individual, we do it as a party.

Mr. Bradley: If the Peugeot is to be produced in Canada, that would be Canadian content. We would insist the largest proportion of that, 80 or 90 per cent be produced in Canada—

Mr. Cooke: When are the Liberals going to bring in content legislation?

Mr. Bradley: The member will have to ask his friends in Ottawa that, because it was his friends who put that party back in power. They defeated the Conservatives and brought it back to power in the next election. The member for Ottawa Centre will have a hard time figuring that out.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: Would you ask the member for St. Catharines to run through that one again? I did not quite get it.

The Acting Speaker: I would appreciate all honourable members allowing the member for St. Catharines to speak to the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. Cassidy: He accused the New Democratic Party of putting the Liberals back in power in Ottawa. I heard him distinctly.

The Acting Speaker: There is confusion all over this place.

Mr. Bradley: Mr. Speaker, I will be brief in my response to that because I want to clarify what I have said. We all recall that famous night when Walter Baker was unable to count appropriately, and when the New Democrats voted along with the Liberals, the federal alliance, to defeat the Progressive Conservative government at that time.

Now they are paying the price, particularly in western Canada, for that kind of support of the Liberal position on that evening, which brought down that government and ensured the re-election of the Liberal party. Is what I have said not logical?

Interjection.

Mr. Bradley: Let me describe another area in which the provincial government can be of some assistance. I do not want to go into the last budget in Manitoba and how it raised taxes, because that is irrelevant to our provincial budget.

The Acting Speaker: No, we are talking about the Ontario budget.

Interjections.

The Acting Speaker: Order.

9:30 p.m.

Mr. Bradley: I want to go to another area where the provincial Treasurer could have been of assistance to those communities which have been particularly hard hit by unemployment.

I think of the St. Catharines area, Hamilton; certainly Sudbury and Windsor. These are areas of extremely high unemployment in Ontario that are being hit very hard by high welfare costs. After the unemployment insurance bene-

fits of people run out, many of them are forced to seek social assistance from the regional municipality or the other municipality that administers it. Then, on that basis, we have substantial increases in the budgets for those communities.

It is a double whammy because those communities are already hit hard by unemployment; they are already suffering from a decline in assessment. The government then turns around and asks those communities to spend more to assist those who require it.

I know that suggestions have come from various areas in the House, but what I have suggested is that the provincial Treasurer provide a formula whereby those communities that have been particularly hard hit by unemployment and have very high welfare bills be assisted to a greater extent in terms of the percentage of the cost of welfare paid by the province.

For instance, at the present time we know the federal government pays 50 per cent, the provincial government pays 30 per cent and the municipal government pays 20 per cent. What I am suggesting is the provincial government, in those areas of high unemployment, provide a greater percentage. It might break down to a split of 40 to 10 per cent or 45 to 5 per cent, depending on the amount of unemployment in a specific area.

That is the suggestion I had, which the Treasurer could have acted upon. Unfortunately he chose not to and therefore our communities have been hit hard.

I could go on all night but, in a sense of fairness, I want to ensure that others have a chance to speak.

I did want to point out to members of the House what the impact of the 1981, 1982, 1983 changes for the average Ontario family were as a result of those budgets. Who in this House remembers, just before the election, when the provincial Treasurer ended his budget speech by saying, "and all this without an increase in taxes."

Let us look at what happened subsequent to the election, subsequent to the realities of March 19.

The Ontario health insurance plan fees have gone up \$368; retail sales tax, excluding the hospitality tax, \$181.08; hospitality tax, \$160.18; liquor and tobacco, \$77; the ad valorem tax on gasoline, \$181.12; provincial income tax, \$368.52. The total increase per family was \$1,336.30, and more if anyone in the family happened to buy a pet, pay university or college tuition, purchase

unleaded gasoline, renew a driver's licence and so on.

These figures are based on a family of four with an average income, a single wage earner and the standard deduction from 1981 and 1982 tax guides, with average consumption adapted from the 1978 Statistics Canada survey, adjusted for inflation, with one automobile and the 1981 Ontario gasoline consumption average.

So the members can see there was a substantial increase since the election, but I am sure that will decrease in the year just previous to the election.

There is one other project that I know is dear to the heart of the member for Ottawa Centre, and to many in this House.

From time to time we look at TVOntario. There are some good programs on TVOntario, by the way. I must say I enjoy some of them. One of those programs is the question period from Ottawa; I mean the entire question period. We also see on the Canadian Broadcasting Corp., at the end of the week, a half-hour program, *This Week in Ottawa*. It outlines the highlights of speeches from various people in the federal House.

What they have in Ottawa, as they have in some provincial jurisdictions, is what is called the electronic Hansard. They have full coverage of events taking place in the House.

In this province and in this Legislature we have been well served by those who operate the newsreel cameras that are in the Speaker's gallery. During question period there is ample coverage of what is going on as far as the leaders are concerned and many of the lead questions; there is an opportunity for them to focus on those things they feel are important, and there are interviews out in the hall. So there is very good coverage at the present time.

But what some of us are suggesting—and I think not just those of us who are in opposition; there are a few on the government side—is that we implement additional coverage, a broadening of the coverage of the Ontario Legislature, so that the people of this province have direct access through television cameras to the proceedings of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario, where many of the major policy decisions are made and the expenditures of dollars take place.

I am not suggesting we have an elaborate system that is going to cost millions upon millions of dollars but a system that simply operates as it does in the two premier shows for

the provincial government: that is, the provincial budget and the speech from the throne. Members will recall that in this chamber at those times there was a camera behind the opposition benches and another behind the government benches, and these cameras could be used to televise the entire question period.

Some will say, "Well, of course there can be coverage, and if the news people feel it is of importance, they will cover it." But we must recognize that they have their time limitations. For instance, if question period goes on until 4 p.m. or 4:30 p.m. and they want to interview the leaders outside, often those cameras are taken down, perhaps with 15 minutes left in question period; so if one of the members—the member for Lakeshore (Mr. Kolyn), for instance—were to ask a question in the House in the last 15 minutes, a question of great importance to his constituency, it might not receive the coverage it deserves. The member for Sudbury, I think, has two primary television stations in his area.

Mr. Conway: Are they both nationalized?

Mr. Bradley: They could be.

He might well be in a position of wanting to ask a question, and on occasion he has asked some questions on behalf of his constituents that have been embarrassing to his colleagues. In perhaps the last 10 minutes of question period he might have a question that is of importance. That question does not receive the kind of coverage it might if there were an electronic Hansard trained on him.

So what some of us are proposing—and I know there are others in the House: the member for Sudbury East (Mr. Martel), the member for Ottawa Centre, the member for Renfrew North and others—is that an electronic Hansard be available so the people of this province will have access to the entire question period and to other debates that take place in this House, and that there be full coverage so the people of Ontario can see what is going on.

If we in the opposition do not fulfil our obligations, do not perform well, then that is our fault; if the government does not, that is its fault. But the people can make that judgement about what is going on in this assembly. It is supplementary service. It is not a service that I think should supplant any of the newsreel cameras. In fact, if the government were to suggest that the newsreel cameras be removed and replaced, that would be unacceptable to us and unnecessary on their part.

It is something that can be implemented, and

I think if we want to talk about equality of access, the people in all parts of this province would then have direct access to this Legislature.

I have gone on at some length. There are many other issues I would like to raise in this House, but I will have a chance to raise them on other occasions. I have appreciated the opportunity to share with others in the House a few thoughts on this budget. I believe it is a deficient budget but I think in some very specific areas it can be helpful to the people of this province. I look forward to listening with a good deal of care to the contributions that will be made by other members of the House this evening.

Mr. Breagh: Mr. Speaker, I want to begin my contribution to the debate by speaking, as I usually do, a little bit about the process that results in a budget as it is presented here at Queen's Park.

It is one that from the outside, I am sure, is strange indeed to an observer who is not involved in the budgetary process in the sense that he might work for the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) or for an opposition member, because the focal point of it is that in a very complicated age, with questions around unemployment and productivity and economic growth that even world-wide experts cannot seem to agree on, and with a great deal of public argument about all of those things, the process comes down to one individual who, in theory, is the only person in the province who knows what the budget contains before it is put out.

It seems to many observers and to me that is a strange process, which might have been appropriate 100 or 200 years ago, but does not fit the world as it is now.

9:40 p.m.

In recent years we have seen the traditional budgetary process change a little bit. We have seen it expanded so that both here at Queen's Park and in the federal Parliament, treasurers say they have consulted widely before they prepare a budget. There is a great deal of fanfare about the number of groups that have been to see the treasurers and have had an opportunity to make a presentation to the treasurers, both provincial and federal. I guess the myth is perpetuated that there is a lot of consultation, but we soon see when the budgets are revealed that there may have been a treasurer or members of his staff sitting in the same room, but that does not necessarily mean there was a lot of talking back and forth. There may

have been some listening but not necessarily much impact.

All that we do in our parliamentary system around the preparation of a budget has an aura of secrecy about it. It comes back to the idea that one person has the mental ability to prepare something that will resolve the economic problems of a nation or a province. It has always been my contention that that is a completely absurd thought. That is not the way it is practised in reality or something that is appropriate to a modern world or something that serves our parliamentary system well.

To be fair and to put a little balance into the argument, the Treasurer made the argument in here himself that that is the old traditional concept of a government and that a government may fall, in fact, on a budgetary matter. That is true, but surely it cannot be beyond the creativity and imagination of modern parliamentarians to put an influx of openness into that system.

In the last couple of years, for a variety of reasons, we have seen the preparation of papers that purport to bring about more openness in the budgetary process. Unfortunately, a series of events—oddly enough, parallel events in this year's federal budget and the provincial budget—blew away the whole myth of secrecy.

In one instance, Mr. Lalonde inadvertently displayed a budget book that was picked up by a television camera, monitored, enlarged and translated, so that what he thought were secret parts of his budget were known before they were presented to Parliament or to the Canadian people. In the other instance, portions of our Treasurer's provincial budget were found in a garbage bag and then published in the *Globe and Mail* with a great deal of foofaraw. In both instances there seems to have been an explosion of the myth of secrecy for different reasons in different circumstances.

I want to put on the record again my feeling that there must be ways in which the process of putting together a budget, the process of examining what needs to be in a budget and the process of putting forward solutions, can be done in a different and more open way involving more human beings, more skills, more information, and with dissemination of that information to the public that supposedly will feel the impact of this economic measure.

There is a difficulty in making this argument in this House, even with a Treasurer who has just gone through an experience which, one would think, would tend to make him back off

from his very traditional feelings about the preparation of a budget and the power of a Treasurer and the secrecy that is necessary. When we had this discussion last year, at the end the Treasurer got up and in a very few words said I did not know anything about the parliamentary system.

This was despite the fact that I had been on a procedural affairs committee studying parliamentary systems around the world with several of his colleagues and members of the Liberal Party and my own caucus. I am not speaking off the top of my head. Many of us in this chamber have spent a lot of time and effort looking at other systems, finding things we could use here that would not challenge the traditions of a parliament but that would open them up and make them look at the preparation of a budget in the context of the world in which we live.

The parallels between what happened to Mr. Lalonde—and our Treasurer's comments that he must resign—and what happened to our Treasurer in the preparation of his budget here are really quite remarkable.

Frankly, I was rather taken aback by the number of people who, during the controversy, said they really liked the Treasurer but thought he ought to resign. I want to put forward the counter-argument: I do not like the Treasurer, not in personal terms but because of the things he has done in this budget; however I would rather he did not resign, but looked at his process and opened it up and responded to the things the standing committee on procedural affairs has recommended this House give consideration to, as have many other people in the parliaments around the world.

The parallels between the federal Minister of Finance and our Treasurer are really quite remarkable this year, not only around the preparation of a budget and the mishaps that caused both of them to get into hot water, but in the assumptions they made in preparation of a budget. Both of them, though they are purportedly from different political philosophies, seem to have written the same budget in a slightly different vein.

Both have as their main premise for what they are doing in the next year, in economic terms for the country and for the province, a remarkable assumption that one can take an unemployment rate of just under 12 per cent and live with it. I find that quite remarkable. If a treasurer or minister of finance had said, for example, five or six years ago in this country, "There is nothing wrong with having 12 per cent of the population

unemployed," that would have been quite a remarkable statement for that person to make.

The fact we have come out of an economic depression which has made the unemployment rate much more severe, has established an attitude so that in places such as Sudbury an unemployment rate of 12 per cent would look pretty good; in my own riding last December and in January this year it would have looked not too bad. It is quite remarkable, then, to see that as a main assumption in the preparation of a budget, both federal and provincial governments have accepted the premise that it is okay to have more than one in 10 unemployed. That I find remarkable.

When they look at some kind of response for what might happen after that, one sees some remarkable assumptions put in place. Both of them have said they want some measure of job creation but that they want it mostly in the private sector. They feel that is the route that will bring about an economic recovery for the country and, in this instance, for the province.

Again, I find that another remarkable assumption, because I do not recall an occasion when the private sector has ever done that. When one speaks to people who are influential in the private sector, one very quickly learns the private sector is pretty straightforward about why it is in business. It is in business to make money, and it says so.

It is not in business to create jobs, although sometimes it does that; it is in business to make a profit. The individuals I respect in the private sector say that in a very open and straightforward manner. They say things such as social services are not the responsibility of the private sector; their contention is that they are the responsibility of government. When they talk about unemployment, they say it is not the responsibility of General Motors or Ford or Chrysler or any other private sector company; they say it is the responsibility of a government.

Yet we now have governments at the federal and provincial levels saying, all of a sudden, "We say all of this is the responsibility of the private sector, and they will take it over." I do not recall anybody in the private sector saying, "Okay, it is our responsibility, and we are going to take that over." So it is quite remarkable that we see parallels between the federal and provincial government in this approach to the private sector.

I want to say a little about unemployment in an unusual way. I sense many members on the government side and others in our society think

that somehow the reason a 12 per cent unemployment rate is okay—not nice, but okay—is that they have traditionally thought the unemployed are really unwashed, untrained, unskilled and unenergetic.

They do not want jobs, they do not work, they are not productive, they do not look good, they do not wash themselves, they do not cut their hair, they do not wear clean clothes. If only they would go out and take a shower and get a haircut and wear a clean suit and learn how to read and write and fill out an application form, they would not be members of the unemployed any longer; they would somehow join the ranks of what some people would call the productive society.

9:50 p.m.

I know some of this government's programs, for example, are directed exactly at that target group. The member for Brantford (Mr. Gillies), who has responsibilities in another incarnation, came to my town and talked about a program for a group of people I happen to like and work with a lot, the John Howard Society in Oshawa. It is a group of people, under Bill Fry and his staff, with which we work a lot. It is not that my constituents are more given to criminal prosecution than anybody else, but somehow we have a relationship that works. We help the John Howard Society a lot and they help us a lot. They are very good and energetic people.

The Ontario youth secretariat has a program that deals with literacy and getting people back to work, young people in particular and people who have run afoul of the law. In this instance, the member for Brantford said something like 59 young people had gone through this program, had learned a little about reading and writing and, I suppose, arithmetic; and had learned a little more about how to get a job in the first place with the help of the John Howard Society.

He was quite enthusiastic that something like 59 young people had gone through this program and 36 of them had retained their jobs. That is good. There is no question in my mind that 36 young people in my region of Ontario getting jobs because of a government program is nice. But if one is looking at 12,000 unemployed people, which I am, it may be nice but it is not significant. Part of the problem is that people have to understand who is unemployed these days and what the problem is.

I know members opposite may not like it too much, but I ran across one neat little piece of business. There had been a lot of discussion in

this Legislature well before I got here about the Tory patronage scheme in Ontario. On the standing committee on procedural affairs we had some discussions with groups like the Liquor Control Board of Ontario about whether there is patronage left in the LCBO. Of course we were assured there was not; at one time there might have been, but there is not any more. I was impressed with the presentations: one fills out an application form, which goes to Lakeshore, and the most qualified people get jobs. All of that seemed quite normal.

But I ran across a term that was new to me; it is "ministerial referral." Some young people came to my office who said they went to apply for jobs at Whitby Psychiatric Hospital, jobs they had held in previous summers. These young people found that although the hospital wanted to hire them because they had performed that task before and their work had been satisfactory, they could not be hired.

Somebody had sent a memo, saying: "This quota"—it was something like 15 per cent of the jobs this summer—"will be held for ministerial referral." That struck me as interesting, because I had not heard the term before. The member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Laughren) explained some things to me. It was used in the Ministry of Natural Resources last year and, I think, in previous years.

It seems someone has decided that we will not have patronage any more, but we will hold a certain number of jobs in the ministries; we will tell people who run those institutions to hold on to 15 per cent of their jobs and those referrals will come from the minister's office. They say, "Whether you want to hire them or not, whether you like them or not, whether you have someone locally who is more deserving and can do that job better, hold on to those jobs."

That is a concept of sophistication. We do not have patronage in Ontario; we have something called ministerial referral. In essence, it is a pretty good description of the Tory philosophy: call it by another name and it will mean something else.

I want to talk a little about who is unemployed, because I think this is an important topic. I pulled the files of three people who have been to see me recently who are out of work and have been for some time.

One interesting case is that of a man who is 39 years old. He has an honours bachelor of arts degree. He has his grade 13. He has been to Humber College. He had a good job for a number of years. He has a fairly good amount of

work experience with several firms up to the position of administrative assistant to the vice-president. He is not a member of the great unwashed. He is somebody who has worked his way up through the system, who has done what society says one ought to do: "Get a good education, work hard, and get some work experience."

He is a victim of the circumstances of our time. He is someone who does not need to be told how to dress, how to fill out an application form or how to write a résumé. He is someone who can do all those things very well and has been doing so for the past two years and still cannot get employment. That speaks to some of the concerns I have heard other members raise, saying: "If only people would look for it, the work is there. If only they would clean up their acts, there would be no trouble getting jobs."

Another case is that of a young man who from time to time has worked for several of the short-term programs in various ministries. In other words, one can do a job and do it well for the Ministry of Health or the Ministry of Revenue, but at the end of a certain time period—three months, six months, six weeks, eight weeks—that job no longer exists. So you fish around and try to find another similar kind of job with another ministry, but it is much the same kind of thing.

This is a young man with a BA, who has taught in schools, has worked for General Motors, has worked for two or three of the ministries. We cannot find anything in his work record that says this person is not ambitious, does not work hard, does not do a good job, has not succeeded at the jobs he has been able to get. But again, he seeks to better himself and cannot. The jobs are not available, not for want of trying but for the very simple and unfortunate reason that jobs are not there.

I want to raise a third case, and I think I will use the name in this instance, because the person has had a newspaper story written about her. It is one that I found particularly typical, I guess, of the problems this government has in coming to grips with unemployment. This is a young woman whose name is Gloria Nitchie. She lives in my riding. She is 29 years old and a single mother of three. She lived on mother's allowance and found it is not exactly a bed of roses.

She is a bit of a fighter, so she decided she would try to go back to Durham College to get some retraining, because the common mythology out there—and of course Durham College,

like all our community colleges, is very active in pursuing just this point of view—is that you should teach people skills that are needed in the marketplace, train them well and get them back into the marketplace. As an observer of the workings of Durham College, I think they really attempt to do that up there.

Gloria is one who did all that. I will bet most members on the opposite side would say in rather blunt terms that she got off her duff. She went back to school; she is trying to learn new skills.

Now, there is not a lot of money in going to Durham College. But Gloria saw up on the college bulletin board a number of programs that were advertised under the Ontario youth secretariat as a summer program that is known as students in personnel. There is not a lot of money involved in this, but the frank reality of it all is that students need work experience if at the end of their community college career they intend to move into a particular field. They cannot go in there just out of community colleges, and all community colleges are aware of this and try very hard to make sure that college courses are connected with whatever industry or business the students are being trained for.

Here is one who has done what I will bet members would all say she ought to do: get off mother's allowance, go back to school, do something useful, get a job, get some job training. There is only one problem with Gloria; Gloria is 29 years of age, and the youth secretariat, of course, does not function for anybody over the age of 24.

This is a bit of a bind, and I thought: "Well, this is a little dumb. She obviously is a student; she is obviously going to a community college. The minister spends all that money to put up posters about all of these programs in the community colleges. All it is going to take to straighten this out is for me to write to the minister responsible."

I got a response. It seems that a couple of years ago under the Human Rights Code you could not have done this, because it would have been called age discrimination. When the revisions to the Human Rights Code were put through, amendments were made that provided for affirmative action programs, and they now provide waivers to the Human Rights Code for certain of the ministries.

In this instance that is apparently what happened. The human rights people said they gave a waiver to the youth secretariat so the youth

secretariat said they could not handle it. It strikes me as being unreal that in this day and age a government says it cannot handle this kind of problem, that it cannot admit it has a program in place that it advertises and spends money on and that it is so lockjawed it cannot make an exception or, for that matter, several exceptions to the program. The reply from the minister's office offers the chance for Gloria to go around and look elsewhere and offers some things she already knew, I am sure.

What I find particularly disappointing is that the young man who was in Oshawa, the member for Brantford, is the same member who replied to Gloria. While on the one hand he comes to my town and says to the people in my community, "Here is our government doing good things for people in your community, trying to get people back to work," and we are all supposed to applaud for him—and we did and do and will again—on the other hand when he is asked to review the case of an individual who needs some help, his reply is two pages long but in essence means, "Tough luck, too bad, look elsewhere, try somebody else."

10 p.m.

That is what I find particularly aggravating about what the government of Ontario is trying to do these days. Can it not understand in simple human terms, without all the numbers, statistics, analyses, growth projections and all that stuff that surrounds the budget, that the unemployed are not numbers? They are people who require some help.

I am not asking that the government of Ontario design 300,000 individual programs. I am simply saying could they not develop the capacity, the warmth, the humanity to respond to somebody like Gloria Nitchie? Could they not find some way to take the programs and the rules and make them fit the needs of an individual? It appears they cannot and that is a shame.

I want to say a couple of other things about need. All of us who have spoken to this budget talked about the need for things in our ridings, in places we have all been recently when we were back home during the break period. We went through our schools, our hospitals, institutions of different kinds and we saw the paint peeling off the walls. We saw the need at Durham College for expanded facilities to do this kind of retraining program. We saw in our schools that there was a need for capital equipment and repairs. With our municipal people, we saw there was a need to build bridges and fix roads. We know about layoffs. Even teachers

are being laid off these days, which is unusual I admit, but it is real and it hurts a teacher just as much as an auto worker. There is absolutely no difference between the two groups that I can see.

We know there are very real needs in every one of our communities. I have not heard anybody here make a pitch for some grandiose project. As I have listened to the replies to the budget, I have heard a constant stream of people saying: "Do not do dumb things. We do not want big programs about this, that and the other thing. We want you to come and fix my school, my hospital."

Is there anybody here who has not been faced lately by someone saying: "My wife was in the hospital across the road from this Legislature. The paint is peeling off the wall. Can they not afford to paint a hospital room any more?" The truth is, they cannot.

Is there anybody here who has not talked to someone in a community college or university and had it put to him fair and square that the government has been squeezing the very lifeblood out of our colleges and universities for a five- or six-year period and there is no more to be squeezed? Is it any wonder the veterinary college at Guelph is having a little trouble with its certification? It should not be to anybody here; we should all understand that by now.

People are not making a plea that we spend tax dollars stupidly. We could all find some pretty stupid projects that have been undertaken by all levels of government. People are saying there are very real needs.

I am looking at municipal budgets now that have been faced with substantial squeezes; things such as libraries. Library boards across Ontario were told they are not going to get any more than five per cent. For some strange reason, they assumed the payments to library boards next year would probably not give them a lot but would give them the five per cent. Now I am told they are going to get nothing. They may get what they got last year, but they will not get any increase. That is a little unreal.

I know people can make all kinds of arguments, such as: Libraries are not essential; they are not top priority with the government any more; we have cut back facilities for blind and deaf students so we have to cut back there; the same meanness should apply to other places. It is reaching the absurd.

I have listened to government members talking about the closing of institutions. Some government members, particularly ministers of the

crown, seem to say, "This is a good thing. We have to close down institutions, but do not close mine." There are some who would be unkind and say that is just being selfish for the needs of one's own riding or one's own political gain.

I honestly do not think so. I believe individual members know their constituencies reasonably well. They know what works and what does not work in their community. When some ordinary Conservative member stands up in the Legislature and presents a petition which says, "Do not close this thing; it works; it is needed in my community," the government ought to pay some attention. It should take that as a sign that there are some things wrong with what it calls a restraint program, there are some things that hurt individuals and that the government is not doing the right thing about them. Unfortunately I do not see much of a response.

As I look through the budget that is here, I see, both in print and in what ministers say, a constant movement of costs and of responsibility on to the municipal tax base. As I read the clippings as they come in, I see boards of education taking a lot of flak around Ontario because they must by law raise tax dollars to provide programs this Minister of Education (Miss Stephenson) says they must provide though they cannot afford to do it. The actual tax dollars they get from Ontario are remaining about the same, with the percentage declining substantially. There is a bump at the municipal level.

I see many municipalities trying to respond and, of course, they can. They could shut down the system, there is no question about that. They can and in many cases have shut down, they have laid people off and they have stopped doing things because they have to hold the line on property taxes because the system will not take any more.

We do have those needs. They are identified in every municipal budget I have looked at in the last few years. They can easily be identified by members from all sides of this House in their own ridings. I do not think there is any question that one could, if one wanted, take another look at unemployment, take another look at the needs of people across Ontario and provide a rather different kind of budget than we have here.

I am interested in some of the things that were almost thrown away, not said at the tail end of this budget. One small thing was dropped at the end of it. The Treasurer was making his argument about fiscal responsibility and good credit

ratings and all of that. At the end of his budget statement he said, "But we have to cut \$300 million in order to bring this budget in line with only a \$2.7-billion deficit."

I find it rather remarkable for someone to preach restraint, to say a credit rating is the most important thing in the world and the deficit is under the \$3-billion mark—to say at the front end of a budget that it is \$2.7 billion—and then at the back end of a budget, "All we have to do to make the thing work, folks, is cut another \$300 million from the ministry."

There is no pleasant way to say this. That \$300 million is going to come out of the hides of the residents of Ontario, even those who voted Tory. That means the school boards, municipalities and community colleges which at the front end of this budget may get something good and be among the lucky ones getting a little help with Canada-Ontario employment development programs or benefiting a bit from manpower training programs, should know now the \$300 million will be coming out of their tails at the end of the system. They may be very grateful and happy when the minister arrives with the cheque to build a new building, but they had better know there is a chunk of money coming out of the system by the end of this process. That, I think, is a pretty tough way for the Treasurer to present what appears on the surface to be not a controversial budget.

A couple of other things struck me in here. He has mused and mused in other quarters that the end is near for property tax credit. Members may recall that this program was introduced some years ago and "this and other programs," he says, "are things which need to be reviewed." I could list some government programs under way now that do not appear to be working particularly well. I could give chapter and verse on a number of things this government is doing which I think the world could live without. There are a lot of things Ontario spends money on which do not appear to me to be necessary and which the Treasurer could chop. It seems to me particularly ironic, at the same time he is loading on to the municipal property tax base more programs and more requirements, that this seems to be one of his prime targets for removal of programs.

It seems fairly clear to me in the latter part of the budget—and one really has to read its fine print to find these things—that the government of Ontario, and in particular the Treasurer, have at least put on the table the threat to extend the wage control program. I do not think

there is any question this pretty controversial program, which was brought in to save the nation federally and to save the province provincially last fall, is something whose full impact we have yet to see.

10:10 p.m.

We do not yet know how many people are going to get targeted by this; we do not yet know whether the Anti-Inflation Board will be a particularly effective group of folks or not too effective. I think my guess would be that it will not be effective, that at the end of this wage control period it will propose a motion to extend. Of course, in the second year, when we see this legislation introduced, one of the much-needed things we could do is bring in a garbage truck to handle the members' waste paper and to take the extraneous members out of the chamber.

I think there is very little question that there are needs that could be identified in each of our communities, and that if one looks at the small print in this budget, there are things yet to come. On the surface of it, people will look now and see that the price of a pack of cigarettes has gone up and the price of booze has gone up. Most people in Ontario will look at that and say, "So what; they always do that to me." Then they look at an Ontario health insurance plan premium and say, "So what; these guys are always jamming that one at me." Then they look at a surtax on income for a social services program, and say, "It is new, but they are just sticking it to me in a slightly different way."

I think they ought to be more interested, though, in the very concepts that are put in the back end of this budget: that somewhere, \$300 million is going to come out of it; somewhere, programs are going to get pulled at the last moment to make the books balance; somewhere, without question, there will be an extension of wage controls in the public sector. That, I think, is a rather unusual way, to put it politely, to prepare Ontario for economic recovery.

I want to say something about the response of the budget to unemployment, because again, like the proposals from the youth secretariat, young people are recognized as being a major problem of unemployment. There is a response, and I suppose now the Treasurer and all the members opposite will go around Ontario saying: "Yes, we did something for youth. We did something for the municipalities. We extended this Canada-Ontario employment development program, we are going to build some new things, we are going to do some manpower training."

That is true. There is just enough of that kind of programming in this budget for the members opposite to go around Ontario, or stand in the Legislature and say, "Well, we have a program for youth." Never mind, like the case I outlined before, this deals with 36 people out of 12,000 unemployed. Never mind whether or not it works, we have a program.

I think in large measure the responses to unemployment that are contained in this budget are just simply that: they are meant to be a political response. They are designed so that ministers of the crown and others can say, "We responded." From their point of view it does not matter whether or not they work, it does not matter whether they do anything to relieve unemployment. It really does not matter either whether they do anything to turn the economy around. What matters is that there is a program, a brochure, a pamphlet, a poster, something that justifies saying, "We did something, never mind what." That, I think, is tragic because that is rather typical of what the government of Ontario has tried to do for a number of years.

There is one other thing that disturbs me immensely about what this government has done to the budgetary process and to the taxation process in the course of several budgets—not all at once, but over half a dozen of our budgets. It has found a group of folks it wants to tax, people with lunch buckets under their arms, people who work in offices and factories and businesses, people who get a regular weekly paycheck. It wants them and it is going to zap them in as many ways as it can.

Of course we have theoretical arguments about what is a fair tax and what is not a fair tax. I must admit, the opposite side has taken a rather unique view of how to tax people. The first rule of their process is: do not call it a tax, find another name; call it a surtax, maybe. There is one of those in the 1983 budget. It is new and different, and people will take a little while to figure out what that is. Call it a premium; it does not matter whether it has anything to do with health care or not. Call it another name and collect it.

Their favourite one, which they use extensively now, is one that has nothing to do with them from the public's point of view. That is to say, with all those little manipulations that happened at the gas pump—where some guy in a Gulf jacket comes out, pumps gas in your car and collects a whole lot of tax money for Ontario—it is tough for the average motorist to figure out that the Treasurer of Ontario is

grabbing his tax dollar when a guy in a Gulf jacket is pumping gas in his car. It is tough to make that point. One does not see the Treasurer of Ontario out there grabbing pennies off you, but he is.

It is tough when one goes into a smokeshop now to see that the reason a pack of smokes costs \$2 is that governments, federally and provincially, decided this was a major source of revenue and they ought to grab as much as they can. We should not get too hypocritical about this; these are not taxation measures designed to convince the population to quit smoking for health reasons. These are taxation measures to grab a lot of money out of the little folk; it is as simple as that.

The same goes for the price of booze, which this government has turned into a major taxation source. The fact that it nationalized the sale of booze in retail stores some time ago and purports to be a free enterprise party, is another matter we will deal with on another day. What I want to deal with tonight is that it is a major source of revenue. Every month the government raises the price, and in every budget it raises the tax structure. It has now become a government which is really dependent upon the sale of booze and the fact that people will continue to smoke.

In later years the government of Ontario has moved hot and heavy into the numbers racket. It is impressive when one looks in this budget as to how dependent this government has become on the numbers racket in Ontario. If people stopped betting on the ponies, if people stopped buying numbers racket tickets in their various forms, this government would be in financial difficulty. Yet those are not called taxation measures.

They do recognize the impact on the budget in the budgetary paper, but one does not see the Treasurer of Ontario standing in his place saying, "One of my favourite taxes, Lottario, is generating a lot more money for me this year." There is a bit of a distance there.

When one goes to buy a Lottario ticket, it is true it has something to do with Ontario but it is not an agent of the Treasury who is standing there, or an agent of the Ministry of Revenue; it is your local corner guy. He probably has a licence that says he can collect this, pay this tax, get a refund and do all those things, but he is the person who is selling you all of these matters.

Of course, the retail sales tax is on exactly the same model. It is somebody else, other than the government, who is collecting that tax money.

Most of us are people like me who once a year sit down and figure out their income tax. When they get \$70 back they somehow feel they have beaten the system. It is rather ironic. Very few members in this chamber, especially on this side of the House, have consultants, lawyers and all that stuff who, three or four times a year, advise us how to do this or that, how to get into this tax shelter and wind up like E. P. Taylor paying no income tax at all.

Most of us are ordinary Joes. The federal and provincial governments get the money out of my paycheque before I get it. I have nothing to say about it. I do not miss the money because I never had it, and once a year I sit down to figure out why I should get \$40 back and I feel good.

There is something strange about that psychology. It is rather typically Canadian, but it is true that that is the taxation target; that is the group of people the government wants to get. It wants to get them in as many ways as it can. It wants to nickel and dime them five or six times a day. For most of the members here—Mr. Speaker, stop and think that you are no different from the population at large out there—how many times, and in how many different ways did the members put money into the tax coffers of Ontario today?

It would be unusual if it was not half a dozen times a day that the members got nailed. It would be unusual if they could identify once, during the course of a day, when the Ministry of Revenue and the Treasurer of Ontario extracted money from them during that time period. But they did, and they do that consistently and across the board.

I want to say a couple of things around other matters. I think that as well as the process and measures which were described in the budget, what saddens me somewhat is that there is a potential in this province to do things. Again, as with other measures I have described, this government seems to sense what they are.

It senses that one of our greatest weaknesses is we do no research and development in Ontario at all; nada, not a thing. We know it is one of the greatest weaknesses in our industrial sector. We even know what the weaknesses are. We know that in the automotive industry. We do not do any of that stuff here. Still, after all the years of debate, we test in Kapuskasing whether cars will start in cold weather and that is it.

We have a nucleus of an automotive technical development centre in St. Catharines. What has it done? What is its connection with the private sector? Where is the great plan that will use that

tech centre to develop our auto industry? It ain't there.

Mr. Wildman: The Minister of Industry and Trade (Mr. Walker) says we will get it all from the United States.

10:20 p.m.

Mr. Breaugh: One of the most dramatic examples is that in Peterborough they have a robotics centre. So far they have gone to a convention in the United States to sell their product, which they imported from Japan.

There is no connection between the high-tech centres and our industrial development. There is no plan. Somehow we feel that, unlike the Japanese, the Germans and everybody else in this world, we do not need a plan; we will somehow stumble on to success. That is not going to happen; it never will. Until the connections are made between the industrial sector, the public sector and the high-tech centres and we get ourselves together, develop a plan, make the everyday connections between the tech centres and our industrial life, nothing is going to happen.

We will have some trade shows. We will visit Chicago. We will tour the world. We will publish brochures. While we are doing this, the Japanese are going to snow us under with their technology. There is no question in my mind that one of the saddest things in this budget is that a political mention is made of the high-tech centres and absolutely no consideration is given to their utilization. There is no connection between the auto industry in Oshawa run by General Motors and the automotive tech centre; none. We can find a public relations connection if we look hard enough, but that is the extent of it. The day-to-day work in the plant does not change because the government of Ontario set up an automotive tech centre somewhere in the province.

What is tragic about that is the lost potential. There is a chance there, just a chance, that we might take the technology we can develop and do what other countries in the world have done. We should not forget that what happened in Japan was pretty simple; they took technology that came out of the United States. The American auto producer said: "Technology? What the hell are we going to do with technology? We don't need that. We produce cars over here." People who had bright ideas took their thoughts, their designs and their mechanics to another country that put its act together and planned its economy. Now they are back here challenging.

If one went to General Motors, Ford or Chrysler 10 years ago and asked them, "What do you think about the offshore imports?" the answer was the same: "What the hell, they will get nine per cent or 10 per cent of the market. That is it. That leaves us with only 90 per cent of the market. Are we worried? The Volkswagen Beetle is a passing fad. Who is going to buy a funny little Japanese car anyway? That is not what North Americans want." It was not until imports got up to around 20 or 25 per cent of the market in North America that the companies began even to think there might be a problem and the North American auto industry actually might have to do something.

One of the tragedies in this budget is that it says where the tech centres are but it does not indicate the connection between tech centres and our industrial life. It will not indicate where we are going or how we are going to get there. It suggests we should hope that somehow these tech centres will infiltrate into our industrial life and that somehow we will come back in good form. I do not think that is going to happen.

Mr. Wildman: The Minister of Industry and Trade is going to line them all up with the Pentagon.

Mr. Breaugh: Quite possibly.

One of the things that bothers me a bit is that in this budget, and again in Mr. Lalonde's budget, there is some talk of a recovery. There is the usual garbage about having turned the corner and there being light at the end of the tunnel and all that kind of stuff. What recovery? Where?

The member for St. Catharines (Mr. Bradley) said that in his town, and in mine supposedly, the recovery is under way. For some folks, yes. There are some people at General Motors who have now been recalled on a second shift in the truck plant and in other plants. But I want to put it on the line. Even in the auto plant that is back to work, somewhere in the shuffle we lost 2,000 jobs, and it is not through yet. Some of us are back to work, but not all of us. Those who never had a job in the auto plant are still as badly off as they were before GM recalled the second shift.

To say my community is better now is only, to be truthful, to say marginally better. If one talks to the people who have just been called back, who have been back to work now five or six weeks, and asks them, "Do you think this thing has recovered? Have we turned around?" they say: "Hell, no. I am back to work now; we are doing a little bit of overtime. But I remember in the fall before the big layoff, we were doing

overtime. I remember we were doing double shifts in our truck plant in the fall, and when the yard was full of little trucks, what happened? They shut the plant down. That is what happened." They remember it was not that long ago it happened to them, and they are not sure at all the job they have right now is going to be there six months from now. They are not sure what kind of cars are going to be made in Oshawa in the next 12 months.

We have heard two or three versions of that so far. We do know that people who have a lot of seniority in our plants have lost their jobs. That is not because they did something wrong, but because the jobs are not there any more. There is just no hope. So to talk about recovery is nice and polite, but it is irrelevant; it is not there. To say one can find little indicators in the economic analysis from some writer here or some statistic there, saying we have turned the corner, is premature, to be polite about it.

I want to say a little bit too about productivity because I have heard other members talk about that. I think there are some pretty silly words around, and that is one of them. When one speaks about comparing our auto industry with the Japanese, people say Japanese workers work for less money. The fact is they do not; the wage rates are comparative. Then the value of the yen drops a bit and that hurts.

When one asks how come Japanese organized labour works so well with management, the fact is there are a lot of people in Japan who make cars who are not organized. They have two levels going there. It is true there are some organized workers, but there are a whole lot of unorganized workers too, and there are a lot of considerations about productivity and management which are reasonably sensible propositions.

I like to quote Don Hackworth, the president of General Motors, who said in at least one speech that the number one problem in the Canadian auto industry and in the North American auto industry is not the worker; the number one problem is management. I believe that. I believe we have not changed our management techniques in North America in virtually any of our industrial sectors since the turn of the century. If you cannot run the machines the same way you ran them at the turn of the century, you sure cannot run the work force in the same way.

The lessons have got to be learned, whether people like them or not. Whether it affects the status of the foreman in the plant or the management people who walk through the

plant, it is pretty clear to me that if they do not learn some lessons on how to deal with human beings, we are not getting any better, we are getting worse. It was bad enough when the rest of the world was kind of ignorant of this as well, but now there are nations in the world who understand that the relationship between management and worker is an important one. This is not the 17th century; these are not a bunch of coolies the government is dealing with out there. It has to learn to listen and to talk and to lead and to co-operate.

I want to say one or two words on that because I listened to Marc Lalonde at the end of his budget where he went strictly to the private sector and said, "To heck with what organized labour, or unorganized labour for that matter, thinks is a priority. Here is mine: the private sector." Then in Ontario the Treasurer said, "Here is mine: small business."

At the end of all this garbage where they picked one sector of the economy and say, "That is where we are going, that is where our incentives are," then they turn around to all the other sectors in the economy and say: "Now we want all of you kids to get on-side with this. We know we rejected what you had to say when you consulted with the Treasurer previously, we know we did not pay any attention to your needs or your wants or something that would do good for you. We know we went to another group in our society—the private sector—and said, 'Here you are, boys, here are all the goodies.'"

After the government has given to one part of our economy all the goodies, then it turns around to all the other parts and says, "Now we want some co-operation." That is dead wrong. If people want to talk about productivity, if they want to talk about co-operation, if they want to talk about changing techniques that involve a good deal of consultation from all sectors, then the government had better design budgets which do that as well. It had better design budgets that are balanced between the private sector and the public sector. It had better design incentives that are fairly distributed across that spectrum and that reflect the things it heard from those people as well.

If the government is not prepared to do that in the development of its economic plan and the development of its budget, then it should stop being so hypocritical as to turn around at the end of all this and say, "Now we want everybody to co-operate." If they want everybody to co-operate, they should start listening to everybody.

I want to conclude on two small points. One is, I have heard some people talk about the private sector and free enterprise. I do not know where they live, but it cannot be Canada. We began as a crown corporation. The history of this country has that mix, integral. How ironic it is that the Conservative Party under Sir John A. Macdonald began one of the largest socialist ventures in the country—building a railway line. How ironic that in the Parliament of Canada this morning we are still arguing about the Crow rates, whether the damned railway works or does not work, or charges too much money or does not, and who will get the subsidy and who will not.

There is not a free private enterpriser left in North America. I wish we would all admit that. The only difference is that the little guy that I represent wants a buck and a half this week in terms of an allowance. The guys at the other end of the block in their three-piece suits want a \$2-billion exemption for this, that or the other thing, or to set up a trade barrier, or to pay somebody not to produce some goods, or to subsidize this plant or guarantee this loan.

None of us believes in that kind of stuff any more. Members across the way do not, those who run the liquor stores and the hydro and the roads and the sewer systems and Suncor and transportation systems. It is not a free enterprise party, so why do they not admit it? Why do they not say—and would it not be a useful exercise for all of us to say—that our needs in Canada have nothing to do with the philosophies of another century?

Why do we not come together? Why do we not try to do some things that do not reflect words that are too simplistic; things that recognize how tough it is, how much need there is for a change in the way we put together a budget, for a change in the way we review a budget, for a change in the way we deal with our economy. I believe that was the chance the Treasurer had and on which he passed.

On motion by Mr. Elston, the debate was adjourned.

10:30 p.m.

INDIAN BAND AGREEMENT

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to standing order 28(b), the member for Algoma (Mr. Wildman) has given notice of his dissatisfaction with the answer to his question given by the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Mr. Henderson) concerning the changes in the draft

agreement between the provincial government and the Islington band.

Mr. Wildman: Mr. Speaker, I note with regret, but not a great deal of surprise, that the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development has not come into the House to listen to this debate or to participate and respond. This is really not too surprising. Apparently the government takes this attitude towards all the questions raised in this manner in this House.

I think it is also indicative of the attitude of the provincial government, which has not seriously tried to finalize the negotiations with the Islington band over compensation for damages and loss of livelihood or new economic development since this process began. The government has been dragging its feet for four years through the negotiations, and it is now more than 13 years since the discovery of mercury pollution in that area.

Today in the House, the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development referred to the statements he made on Tuesday that the changes in the draft agreement with the band "improved the clarity and accuracy of the agreement, but have not altered the major thrust of the agreement."

When faced with the fact that article 2 of the February draft provided for the transfer of the ownership of the land and the buildings for the greenhouse, a \$1-million asset, while that article in the new agreement provided only for a 10-year lease of the land and for ownership of the building to revert to Ontario if the agreement with the Ministry of Natural Resources for seedlings was not renewed, the secretary for some reason quoted a paragraph he claimed was part of article 2 on page 4 of the draft agreement. He said this confirmed that all along only a lease was contemplated. He claimed the changes in the new draft were only clarifications.

I have searched through both copies of the draft—the February draft and the draft the minister referred to on Tuesday—and the paragraph he quoted in the House today is not included in either draft. When the secretary quoted another paragraph, which he said was on pages 9 and 10 of the draft agreement regarding the rice harvesting agreement, I again searched through both drafts and it is not included either.

I do not know what the minister was reading. Either he was reading part of the covering letter he sent to Chief Mandamin or, more likely, a ministry briefing note that was written for him

by some member of his staff to try to explain to him what this was all about.

Mr. Boudria: Unsuccessfully.

Mr. Wildman: I am afraid unsuccessfully. At any rate, what he read was not part of either draft of the agreement. I think it was very inappropriate for the minister to get up and try to give the impression that he was reading from the draft agreement when it is not included in either draft.

No matter how much the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development tries to confuse the issue, the fact remains the provincial government has significantly downgraded the settlement offer that was made to the Islington band at Whitedog. The new offer is not worth nearly as much as the first one and is at least \$1 million less in value than the original draft that was signed by Chief Mandamin in March.

This government has failed to meet the challenge to bring the negotiations to a successful conclusion which was presented to it by the Islington band in March when it signed the February draft agreement and sent it to the Premier (Mr. Davis) for his signature. Instead, the government, led by the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development and the Minister of Northern Affairs, the member for Kenora (Mr. Bernier), decided to renegotiate the February

agreement not with the Islington band but with a citizens committee from Kenora and Ear Falls—some might say the Kenora riding association of the Progressive Conservative Party.

That group is apparently diametrically opposed to the recognition of the band's aboriginal claims and its rights to compensation for the mercury pollution. As a result of these negotiations with this so-called citizens group, the government rewrote the agreement and came up with a new draft which was presented on Tuesday by the minister. That draft has changed substantively; it is not just clarification of words. It is a substantive change in the agreement proposed. In doing this, the provincial government is forcing the band to seek an adequate settlement through the courts because it is impossible for it to reach an adequate settlement through out-of-court negotiation.

The Provincial Secretary for Resources Development is either not being truthful with the House when he claims the changes incorporated in the new draft are only for clarification, or he is so obtuse that he does not understand the significance of the articles he was referring to.

The House adjourned at 10:37 p.m.

CONTENTS

Thursday, May 19, 1983

Budget debate

Mr. J. M. Johnson.....	903
Mr. Bradley.....	908
Mr. Breaugh.....	921

Other business

Indian band agreement, Mr. Wildman.....	931
Adjournment.....	932

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Boudria, D. (Prescott-Russell L)
 Bradley, J. J. (St. Catharines L)
 Breaugh, M. J. (Oshawa NDP)
 Cassidy, M. (Ottawa Centre NDP)
 Conway, S. G. (Renfrew North L)
 Cooke, D. S. (Windsor-Riverside NDP)
 Cousens, D., Deputy Chairman and Acting Speaker (York Centre PC)
 Di Santo, O. (Downsview NDP)
 Johnson, J. M. (Wellington-Dufferin-Peel PC)
 Mackenzie, R. W. (Hamilton East NDP)
 McClellan, R. A. (Bellwoods NDP)
 Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
 Robinson, A. M., Acting Speaker (Scarborough-Ellesmere PC)
 Roy, A. J. (Ottawa East L)
 Stokes, J. E. (Lake Nipigon NDP)
 Turner, Hon. J. M., Speaker (Peterborough PC)
 Wildman, B. (Algoma NDP)



Hansard

Official Report of Debates

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Third Session, 32nd Parliament

Friday, May 20, 1983

Speaker: Honourable John M. Turner

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

Contents of the proceedings reported in this issue of Hansard appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of the speakers taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is \$15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, Information Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 965-2238.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Friday, May 20, 1983

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers.

SPRING FAIR

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: As I am sure the members will know, our party is sponsoring a spring fair on Sunday, May 22, at Harbourfront at the foot of Bathurst Street. It will start at 8:30 a.m. with a pancake breakfast and will go until 11 in the evening. There will be music, dancing, soccer and food.

On behalf of the New Democratic Party and all of our members, I extend an invitation to you, sir. In the absence of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Peterson), I will ask the page to give an invitation to the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk (Mr. Nixon). In the absence of the Premier (Mr. Davis), I wonder if the page can take this invitation to the Minister of Industry and Trade (Mr. Walker) and simply say to him that, although there will not be a shooting gallery there, he is more than welcome to come.

Hon. Mr. Walker: Mr. Speaker, if I may reply to the point of order, I want you to know that I will be visiting the Litton Systems exhibit at the spring fair that the NDP are having.

Mr. Speaker: I thank the honourable member for his thoughtfulness. However, I am not sure this falls within the ambit of being completely nonpolitical, nonpartisan or whatever, and I seek your guidance.

NHL FRANCHISE FOR SASKATOON

Mr. Wrye: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege: Earlier this week my friend the member for Oshawa (Mr. Breagh), very proudly wearing the sweater of the Oshawa Generals, came before this House, and all members from all sides of this House paid tribute to the Oshawa Generals for their role in the Memorial Cup.

As a member of the Legislature, I am of course very proud of the community I serve, the city of Windsor; but I am also very proud of my birthplace, and that is the great province of Saskatchewan. I am sure all members will be shocked and dismayed, as members of this Legislature representing Ontario, at the actions this week of Harold Ballard and the board of

governors of the National Hockey League in rejecting the fine application of that great province for membership in the NHL.

In Windsor, when we want to see NHL hockey, many of us take the opportunity to go across the river to Joe Louis Arena. When teams from Edmonton, Toronto, Montreal and the other Canadian cities in the NHL come to Joe Louis Arena, it is a very special occasion for many of us who had our birthplace outside of Windsor and, indeed, outside of Ontario. I am sure the Saskatoon franchise would have enjoyed that same kind of extra dimension when they came to Joe Louis Arena.

We have many hockey players, some of whom play for the Toronto Maple Leafs, who were born in Saskatchewan. Many of us, including myself, believe the greatest player of them all was a gentleman from Floral, Saskatchewan, Gordie Howe. That spirit would have made the franchise for Saskatoon a great one. It would have added a new dimension, I believe, of Canadian unity.

I hope all members on all sides of this House will join me in suggesting to Mr. Ballard and the other members of the board of governors that they reconsider their very ill-timed decision and grant Saskatoon the franchise that they deserve and that, I am sure, they will live up to.

ATTENDANCE IN HOUSE

Mr. Riddell: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: Looking across the House I see that a number of ministers are not here, and it is indicated they will not be here. They include the Premier (Mr. Davis), the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Norton), the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Bernier), the member for Middlesex (Mr. Eaton), who is a Minister without Portfolio, the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Mr. Henderson), the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Pope), the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Snow), the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) and the Minister of Education and Colleges and Universities (Miss Stephenson). I do not see—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Riddell: Does that not substantiate the need for reform around here?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Where is the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Peterson)? Where are all the rest of your guys?

Mr. Riddell: Let us sit Monday to Thursday and do away with these crazy Friday sittings.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Riddell: This is absolutely ridiculous. Let us have a bit of reform.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: I might point out to all the honourable members that if there are any changes they will come from the assembly.

[Later]

Mr. Newman: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege: Yesterday the Minister of Health (Mr. Grossman) was in the city of Windsor and he took the time to announce to the public that none of the Windsor members was present at that meeting. I would like to mention to the members of the House and to the public in Ontario that the Minister of Health is absent from the Legislature at this moment.

Mr. Speaker: I am sure all members will take note.

[Later]

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, on another point of order: I was quite concerned with something, particularly since you may recall the discussion yesterday on private member's legislation from the member for Essex North (Mr. Ruston) having to do with the attendance in the House. You can imagine how disconcerted he and his colleagues were when the Minister of Health attending a public function in the member's constituency brought to public attention the fact that the elected members for the area were not at the meeting back home.

I would suggest the fact the member for Essex North raised this as a point of privilege merits some concern in the House. I do not know what else he can do except slap a writ on the guy or something like that, because it really would be infuriating where a minister of the crown goes down there in some blooming limousine, goes to a meeting in the member's own area and criticizes the fact the member is not there, when the member is back here in the House doing his duty, which I submit is the principal duty for all of us as elected members, including the members of the administration.

Mr. Speaker: Your point is well taken. I try to be as lenient as I can in dealing with alleged points of order and points of privilege. However, I think in order to preserve some order and

the decorum of the House, rulings have to be made, perhaps not in strict compliance, but in compliance with the standing orders. Having said that, I think you made your point extremely well on behalf of your colleague.

The minister did address himself to the problem and offered the explanation that he made the remarks somewhat facetiously, tongue in cheek and so on. Having said that, I presume the matter is dealt with.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Speaker, if I could talk to that, I would like to point out to the House that the minister isn't in his seat right now—

Mr. Speaker: Order. Will the member please resume his seat.

I just point out that is an example of what I am trying to deal with. That matter was raised earlier. You made your point, and I allowed you to make your point.

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY

McMICHAEL CANADIAN COLLECTION

Hon. Mr. McCaffrey: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to announce this morning to the House that the McMichael Canadian Collection will reopen on Monday, May 23, as promised by me before a committee some months ago. I would like to take this opportunity to invite all members of the assembly to attend this event. In addition to special festivities at the gallery and in the town of Kleinburg there will be a parade featuring antique cars, free concerts, marching bands and plenty of entertainment for the children. All in all, it will be a Victoria Day picnic.

This is going to be a festive reopening for a world-class art gallery that is one of Ontario's major tourist attractions. The McMichael Canadian Collection is unique in North America. With a design that complements its setting in the beautiful Ontario countryside, it is a jewel among this province's cultural institutions. Equally important, it is one of the finest collections of the work of the Group of Seven and represents a vital period in Canadian art when a definite Canadian consciousness began to appear.

We would not have this fine collection of Canadian art had it not been for the generosity and vision of Robert and Signe McMichael. In short, Bob McMichael had a dream and he has realized it. The collection now can be seen and enjoyed to its best advantage thanks to the foresight of the trustees in undertaking the needed renovations. In this regard, I wish to extend a special word of appreciation to Mr. J.

Allyn Taylor for his outstanding service as chairman of the board as well as to all other members of that board. I would also like to compliment the staff at the McMichael gallery for their hard work.

The trustees and the staff of the Ministry of Citizenship and Culture have expended a great deal of effort in making the building safe for both the public and the collection. The gallery is now up to world-class standards. The environment for the art works has been vastly improved. The humidity control and the air conditioning will greatly reduce the potential deterioration of the collection and will extend its life for many decades.

All the renovations have been in keeping with the original architectural design. The character and charm of the gallery that attracted so many people not only has been maintained but also has been enhanced. The real success of the renovations lies in the fact that despite all the changes, repairs and functional additions, the integrity of the original building remains.

10:10 a.m.

I might point out one major improvement that has been made. The whole building is now fully accessible to persons in wheelchairs by means of a series of specially designed ramps.

When the gallery closed, I, along with other members of this assembly, was concerned about the economic impact of that closing on local merchants, for we knew what a major role the gallery had played in the economy of Kleinburg and the surrounding area of Vaughan township.

For this reason, my ministry condensed the rebuilding period. While this increased the cost to the government, it meant that in the long run less revenue would be lost to that community.

The residents and merchants throughout this period were extremely well served in this regard by their representative, the member for York North (Mr. Hodgson), who worked very hard and continues to do so to assist in that area.

I am pleased to announce the gallery's reopening in time for the summer tourist season. The McMichael Canadian Collection will continue to contribute greatly to the local economy.

In closing, I hope the honourable members and others will join with me on Victoria Day in celebrating this event.

Mr. Ruston: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege: I have been advised that the Minister of Health (Mr. Grossman) was in Windsor yesterday and last night, and apparently he was very critical that the three or four members who

represent that area were not at the function he was attending. I want to assure you, Mr. Speaker, and the minister—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Ruston: —that we look after the area, but when there's business to be done in this House—

Mr. Speaker: Will the honourable member please resume his seat?

An hon. member: He's correcting the record.

Mr. Speaker: There is no record to correct.

Mr. Martel: Talk about sleaziness; Larry, you're getting better every day.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Be careful or I'll go to your riding.

Mr. Martel: Well, why don't you come?

Mr. McClellan: Just stay out of Bellwoods.

Mr. Martel: He's teaching you how to be sleazier.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He's teaching you how to be a good member.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

FORT HENRY GUARD

Hon. Mr. Baetz: Mr. Speaker, the Ministry of Tourism and Recreation has achieved remarkable success in promoting the tourism industry with the "Ontario—Yours to discover" marketing campaign.

But strong marketing of the province as a travel destination is only part of the package my ministry deems of essential importance to maintaining the success of this industry. Our product must be continually upgraded if we are to attract more foreign visitors and encourage our own residents to spend more in the province, rather than travelling elsewhere.

Therefore, we have made available a wide range of financial assistance programs; in fact, provincial investment in this key sector of our economy totalled \$44.7 million in 1982-83.

Today I am happy to announce a grant of \$335,300 to expand the guard at Old Fort Henry from 111 men to 141 men over the next two years. This grant is being provided under the federal-provincial eastern Ontario subsidiary agreement.

The increasing popularity of the Fort Henry guard as a travelling drill unit both in Canada and abroad has made expansion of the guard a priority. The EOSA grant will assist in the creation—

Mr. Martel: Did General Walker influence you?

Mr. Rae: Is Walker in charge of this brigade?

Mr. Speaker: Order. Never mind the interjections, please.

Hon. Mr. Baetz: This is tourism.

The EOSA grant will assist in the creation of another guard unit, which would be available for travelling engagements and for additional military displays at the fort, including a third Ceremonial Retreat night. Marketing studies of the Kingston area show that surrounding tourist industries benefit markedly on the evenings of the retreat.

In addition, the travelling unit is expected to have a similar positive economic impact by drawing attention to the unique attributes of eastern Ontario as a travel destination.

This grant is but one example of the positive role the government of Ontario has assumed to stimulate the tourism industry.

PREAKNESS STAKES

Hon. Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, just before the question period, I think in the very fine tradition of the House and perhaps because there is a bit of superstition among horse players—after all, a couple of weeks ago we did wish the—

Mr. Ruston: Here they go, around the bend. What have you got bet on him?

Mr. McClellan: We don't have the covering statement. The standing order requires it.

Hon. Mr. Drea: It really dazzles me that people on the other side of the House will turn their noses down at an industry that employs 40,000 people. They keep walking into it time after time.

Two weeks ago this Legislature—

Mr. McClellan: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: We do not have a copy of this ministerial statement as required by the standing orders.

Mr. Speaker: Obviously, the minister has risen on a point of privilege.

Mr. R. J. Johnston: Mr. Speaker, if he does not have a ministerial statement, he could at least share the Racing Form with us.

Hon. Mr. Drea: To reply to the last one, for many years it has been well known that my best friend is the Racing Form, and I am very particular about who I share my best friend with.

On a serious note, two weeks ago I rose in my place to draw attention to a very fine representative of Ontario in a world-class event, one that

was relatively unknown. Two weeks later, Sunny's Halo is not only the toast of Canada and of Ontario but also one of the toasts of the United States.

In the light of some of the things that were said earlier about what happened to Saskatoon when it was unfortunately denied the right to be in world-class competition, perhaps people in the United States will take another look at what can be accomplished north of the border.

The people of Ontario are very proud of this horse, and I am sure the representatives of the people of Ontario will want to extend to Mr. Foster, the owner, to Mr. Cross, the trainer, and to Mr. Delahoussaye, the rider, all the best in tomorrow's Preakness. Those three people, particularly the two Canadians, Mr. Foster and Mr. Cross, have been first-class representatives of this province. They have brought distinction to this province, along with their horse, Sunny's Halo.

As always, nothing comes easy for a Canadian. He has to come out of the 11 hole tomorrow, which is relatively difficult. One will not get much money at the end of one and three sixteenths miles but, if one has some mortgage money, I would put the mortgage on him because we are going to see the red and white stripes flashing well past the 16th pole and bringing more distinction to an industry in this province that has worked in co-operation with the government, with the public and with a self-help program to establish itself as one of the world leaders.

Mr. Ruston: Mr. Speaker, as to your decision that mine was not a point of privilege, it was certainly more a point of privilege than that was.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

ORAL QUESTIONS

Mr. Conway: Mr. Speaker, one hardly knows where to begin.

Mr. Kolyin: Take your choice.

GASOLINE PRICES

Mr. Conway: I will take my choice, such as it is on this Friday morning. I have a question for my friend the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations.

Mindful of the just-read injunctions of our friends the Minister of Citizenship and Culture (Mr. McCaffrey) and the Minister of Tourism and Recreation (Mr. Baetz) to discover Ontario, whether it be in Kleinburg, Kingston or many points in between, does the Minister of Con-

sumer and Commercial Relations not share with me and millions of others in Ontario a sense of indignation and outrage that, on this first long weekend of the spring-summer season, the retail price of gasoline in the province has doubled in many communities? My colleague the member for Haldimand-Norfolk (Mr. G. I. Miller) tells me that in part of his constituency the retail price has gone from something in the order of 16 cents a litre to 47 cents a litre.

10:20 a.m.

We have heard the minister's comments in connection with this subject on a number of earlier occasions. But given the fact that literally hundreds of thousands of Ontarians are momentarily about to take their automobiles to discover Ontario, is the minister satisfied that the consumers of gasoline in Ontario are not being gouged on this long weekend and that what we are seeing here is not the vagaries of the marketplace but something much more negative and something much more directed at extracting from the consumers as much as those oil companies can on weekends when they know the demand for their product is going to be very high?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, I think the member for Renfrew North and I share an understanding that neither of us is a fortune teller or can see into the future—although both of us happen to believe in the tooth fairy; I agree on that.

Let me also say that I cannot predict what will happen this weekend in the marketplace, but I can say that the Conference Board of Canada, an agency the honourable member's party speaks very highly of, stated as recently as yesterday or the day before that we have now seen a stabilization in gasoline prices and predicted that they may well go down. I know he accepts whatever the Conference Board says, because he has said so many times during a recent election.

But that is not to say there are not great variations in gasoline prices throughout the province. We all understand that. As he has said, there are often good marketplace reasons for that. We also know there has been some concern expressed by many people about the overall marketing practices in the petroleum industry, and that is currently the subject of an inquiry being carried out by the federal government. That is clearly the place it has to be looked at.

Mr. Martel: How long are you going to hang on to that one?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: The member does not like to hear the truth, does he?

Mr. Martel: How long are you going to use that flimsy excuse?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Conway: Would the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations not agree that the millions of Ontarians about to consume gasoline in this province this weekend are more than a little bit justified at the suspicion they harbour about why retail prices are so exceptionally high on this weekend relative to just a few days ago?

Is the minister satisfied that there is not gouging taking place on this weekend, as his fellow Ontarians wish to discover Ontario? Will he give an undertaking to investigate the circumstances in this province this very week to ensure that what we are seeing is the dynamics of the marketplace and not the kind of gouging that many of us feel is taking place?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: I have no reason to believe that we are going to be seeing gouging; that does not mean there will not be. Certainly if there is any business practice that takes place in the community which needs to be looked at, we are always prepared to consider it.

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, in the circumstances the minister talked rather fatuously about the prices coming down. I think the minister should know the facts.

We have done a survey of gas stations across the province over the past couple of days. It shows that in Windsor, St. Thomas, Toronto, Kingston, Thunder Bay, Hamilton, Elliot Lake, Kitchener, Waterloo, Ottawa, Cornwall, Lindsay, Peterborough and Sault Ste. Marie the price increases have been as high as 50 per cent and that right now the prices are ranging somewhere between 46 and 50 cents a litre, whereas recently they had been as low as 25 or 30 cents a litre or even 20 or 22 cents.

As the minister responsible for protecting the consumers of this province with respect to prices, does he not think he has an obligation to defend consumers with respect to retail prices in this province? He cannot fob it off on the federal government. He cannot fob it off on the Liberals. He has an obligation to the consumers of Ontario to see that they are not being taken advantage of on this long weekend.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that it is nice to speak with different tongues on different occasions, and I know the honourable member would like us to duplicate all the efforts

that are being carried out in the national interest. But we do not propose to do that sort of thing. We believe the royal commission that is being carried on at present with respect to oil pricing and marketing is addressing the issues that he is concerned about and that we are concerned about. We have written to the minister to tell him of our concerns.

Mr. Rae: A whole letter? What happened?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Conway: From a government that was happy to spend millions analysing media violence, which was a federal responsibility, it is hard to accept that it is always anxious to restrict itself to its own local jurisdiction.

That having been said, might I ask my friend the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations to share with this House the specifics of his letter to the federal government? When did he write the minister? What did he indicate was the measure of his concern? In his letter did he specifically indicate that the Yo-Yo syndrome is having a deleterious impact on much of the small business sector in this province that is involved in pumping gasoline?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: The Yo-Yo syndrome? That is not a medical term I understand. Is that a Renfrew North term? I have heard of the suck and blow syndrome. Is this a new one?

I indicated to the minister that we had some concerns about pricing practices and about wide variations in prices and that it was our sincere wish that those matters be addressed by the royal commission as it proceeded with its hearings.

Mr. Speaker: New question; the member for Renfrew North.

Mr. Conway: Needless to say, we would like to see a much more active role by the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations, whom we expect to perform more vigorously in this connection.

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

PARAMEDIC PROGRAM

Mr. Conway: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Health. We are mindful that it was more than a year ago that the government of Ontario announced in a speech from the throne that Ontario "will be developing special advanced training programs for ambulance personnel and begin the establishment of a province-wide program of utilization of these services."

That was more than a year ago. We are all aware that in recent days there have been loud

and, in my view, justifiable complaints by many in the medical hospital community—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have to ask the honourable members please to restrict their private conversations. If they have private conversations, conduct them outside the House, please.

Mr. Conway: The minister is aware that in recent days in this city there have been many loud and, in my view, justifiable complaints, but all we have seen from the Minister of Health in the intervening 13 or 14 months have been promises of blueprints and suggestions that more study be developed. So great is the frustration that even Dr. Robert McMurtry at Sunnybrook Medical Centre is reported as having said that he is fed up with blueprints and smokescreens.

How many more people are going to be put in jeopardy while blueprints and smokescreens represent all the government's commitment? When is the promise of the 1982 speech from the throne going to be lived up to? When are we in Ontario going to see an active paramedic program, which is being called for by all parts of the medical and health community?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, that was really a terrific four-minute speech, as I timed it, asking when we are going to start to train paramedics. The answer to that, without taking the time of this House to give not an equally eloquent speech but a lengthy explanation, is that the cabinet committee on social development approved the paramedic program last week, and that paper is on its way to Management Board, which will deal with it perhaps next week or the week after.

Mr. Conway: Can the minister be more specific and more helpful to the thousands of people who will be on the roads and highways of Ontario this weekend, and indeed to people like Dr. Robert McMurtry and others whose frustration is broadcast on this occasion about the lack of government action? When specifically are we going to have the beginnings of that program?

Would he care to comment on the statements attributed to Mr. Enright of his ministry that it cannot be implemented until all kinds of additional infrastructure are put in place? Would he care to comment specifically with respect to Metropolitan Toronto on what we are lacking in this community at this time to prevent an immediate implementation of a much-needed and properly called for paramedic program?

Mr. Speaker: Would the minister address himself just to the question and not the comments?

An hon. member: Oh, come on. That's not fair.

Mr. Speaker: Well, maybe not.

10:30 a.m.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Metropolitan Toronto is just about ready, though not entirely, for a paramedic program which will be totally helpful. One of the major deficiencies is that Metropolitan Toronto lacks the cardio-pulmonary resuscitation training for at least 20 per cent of the population. If we had 20 per cent trained in CPR, which we do not—we are not even close—the numbers of lives that could be saved that the doctors were talking about in the newspaper would be real numbers. I refer to people whose lives could be saved after having suffered some cardiac problem.

Without CPR training, without a citizen getting to a heart attack victim within four minutes, an ambulance arriving in six or seven minutes, which they usually do, will not help at all. It does not matter what emergency-medical-care training the person on the ambulance has—whether the person is an EMCA 1, EMCA 2, EMCA 3, paramedic or a doctor—unless someone is there providing CPR in the first four minutes.

That is one of the reasons we have been trying to encourage municipalities to do all the other things they have to do. If they will do that, then, depending on my Management Board of Cabinet submission, we will be ready to put paramedics on ambulances so we will have an effective and useful system. It is that simple.

Mr. McClellan: Mr. Speaker, does the minister not understand the heads of emergency departments at four major hospitals in Metro Toronto have completely repudiated the nonsense he has just uttered? I refer specifically to Dr. Rowed, Dr. McMurtry, Dr. Borden and Dr. Hastie. They have completely repudiated this nonsense about the necessity of having all these elaborate additional systems in place before a paramedic program can be established.

Would the minister specifically comment on a conversation we had with Dr. Rowed just before question period? He said to us that as of today the hospitals in London, Hamilton, Kingston and Toronto have the necessary sophistication to support a paramedic program. With \$1 million today, he could put 10 rigs on the road and guarantee a saving of life. Why does the minister continue to pretend he has to do a zillion peripheral things?

We know that in Vancouver one in three cardiac arrest victims leaves the hospital. In Kingston, which does not have a paramedic program, a recent study of 65 cardiac arrest victims indicated that none of them left the hospital.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I could take the rest of the question period to discuss those statistics and other statistics which would prove that in terms of the—

Mr. McClellan: Why don't you listen to the doctors instead of your own bureaucrats?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The member mentions certain doctors. Dr. Rowed is deeply involved in this program, as is Dr. McMurtry, largely because of the initiative of Dr. Psutka who works for our ministry. He has involved them so we in the ministry could tap the expertise those doctors have. That is why they are so well informed about the state of our activity. That is why they are urging that we now move in those areas that we believe we now have succeeded in moving in.

Dr. Psutka has explained to the doctors who are making this point this morning that if we have paramedics in those hospitals they should be made useful. I hope these doctors are indicating, after the work they have done with our ministry, that their own hospitals and their colleagues working in other hospitals are prepared to do the necessary things to make paramedics useful.

The member sat through estimates and heard Dr. Psutka go through emergency health care at some length. As he well knows, paramedics must be in radio contact with an emergency physician in a base hospital. Then the acts which are delegated to those paramedics can be done under the direct supervision of a medical doctor who has special training in emergency care. Without that we cannot have the paramedic service.

Are those doctors prepared to say the hospitals in which they work and other hospitals in which their colleagues work are now ready to do several things? Are they prepared to rationalize their facilities so there is a base hospital for all trauma and cardiac victims? Are they prepared to have one hospital shift its activities to another so we can have that contact?

Are we hearing from these doctors that they are prepared in their hospitals to have emergency-trained physicians in the emergency room 24 hours a day in minute-to-minute contact with all

paramedics? Without that, the training paramedics get to deliver delegated medical acts cannot be exercised.

Mr. Conway: Is the minister saying that Drs. Rowed, McMurtry and Hastie are wrong in saying they are ready to go with that paramedic program in this city now?

Given what the minister said earlier about the need for additional work, could he explain the reason for his recent letter? This letter, which is only three or four weeks old, was written to the Niagara Regional Area Health Council turning down their request for training in cardiopulmonary resuscitation. If I recall correctly, he said in his letter that it was premature. How does he square that rejection with his earlier statement that there is more that needs to be done by way of training and education?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is a different problem in the Niagara Regional Area Health Council. They have the CPR training there. In fact, it is one of the best programs in the province for CPR coverage of the population.

Mr. Bradley: It's the funding we need.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, it is not the funding, it is the other things we have talked about that are in place in Toronto, such as the 911 central ambulance dispatch and the tiered response. I have acknowledged and agree that those doctors are ready in Toronto and perhaps Hamilton. Those are the two communities that those doctors and Dr. Psutka in our ministry agree are just about ready.

I only point out this morning that in order for it to have the kind of effectiveness that everyone believes it is going to have with cardiac victims, we are not going to get those numbers without CPR training of 20 per cent of the population. That is the reality.

SAFETY STANDARDS IN MINING INDUSTRY

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, I wanted to ask a question of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Elgie) and I hope he will come back. I will go to a question of the Minister of Labour.

I am sure the minister is aware of the death of Gary Guilbeault at Stanleigh mine in Elliot Lake that I asked him about last week. The coroner's inquest gave its recommendations on Tuesday evening and I am sure the minister is also aware of that.

According to the coroner, the recommendations are basically twofold: that regulations be

drawn up to provide for better lighting, for safety devices, for distinctive markings on the curtains; and—this is important—that employers in the mining industry enforce strict conformity with basic safety rules with all personnel and particularly with operators of these kinds of vehicles.

First, I would like to ask the minister if the government is going to be moving ahead to amend the mining regulations to conform to the recommendations of the coroner's inquest? Second, and particularly, is it going to be moving with respect to requiring employers to enforce the safety standards that have been developed?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, the honourable leader of the third party has brought forward several excellent points. The matter is being looked at very closely within our ministry at the present time. When I say "the matter," I am referring to the recommendations coming out of the inquest. We hope to be able to answer it in more detail in a few days' time. In the meantime, I have prepared a letter which is on its way to the member in respect to his earlier questions about the tragic fatality.

Mr. Rae: The minister will also be aware that one of the questions that is very much at issue, not only in this tragic instance but in many others that have occurred in the last few years, is the question as to whether underground vehicles should be required to have safety roll bars. Does the minister not feel that sufficient evidence was produced at the coroner's inquest in this case—as well as the six deaths which have occurred since 1976 and eight other unusual occurrences which involved the lack of a roll bar—to mean that underground vehicles as well as vehicles that are operating above ground should have these roll bars so we will not have tragic deaths occur such as occurred last week at Elliot Lake?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: The matter of roll bars is under consideration and deliberation at the present time.

Mr. Wildman: Mr. Speaker, could the minister explain why Ted Tuori, one of the ministry inspectors who testified at the inquest, stated that this particular ventilation door had never been inspected and it was not until the accident investigation that it was inspected? This new type of door, which had a safety device which was then removed, had never been inspected by the ministry. Why is the ministry not complying with regulation 3 of the mining regulations

which requires inspections of new installations such as this?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, that comment by the inspector was noted. We are investigating the reasons for his statement and the reasons for the door not being adequately inspected.

10:40 a.m.

GASOLINE PRICES

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, I want to return to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations and ask about the incredible leap in gasoline prices that has taken place over the last while. Peace has been declared very conveniently just prior to the long weekend.

Given that in 1975 his government took action with respect to retail prices in the gas field and given that the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs in Ottawa, with whom he is in constant correspondence it would appear, has stated in the House of Commons on a number of occasions that in his view the federal government does not have jurisdiction with respect to retail prices in the gas sector, does the minister not think he has a clear obligation—instead of giving the consumers of this province the runaround, the old provincial-federal shell game that simply leaves them out in the cold—to take action with respect to retail prices, particularly since his own government was prepared to move some eight years ago?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, the member for York South and I have discussed this issue on other occasions. It is nice to have the opportunity to review it again with him, now that he is back from Dallas. How were the gas prices down there? Everything all right? Did the world look well down there? He came back through Washington. Is the world all right there too?

I am not trying to minimize the impact that the great variation in the price of gas has on individual consumers. I like to think, though, that members understand the consumer price index has been influenced largely by the price wars that have been taking place; we all understand that. They have not been healthy in some areas for some dealers. Many dealers are in great financial difficulty as a result of the price wars, and the member knows that. If he is suggesting that those dealers are gouging people, he should stand up and say so, and let us hear from them about whether they feel they are gouging the public.

Mr. Martel: The dealers have no control.

Mr. Rae: It is not the dealers and the minister knows that.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: I know the member does not like the story. He just likes to be on some side that is criticizing nobody except the government. He knows the dealers have had a very difficult time during the price wars and the change in gas prices recently has been related to the diminution of those gas price wars. He knows the federal government may say what it wishes about this, but it has instituted a royal commission to look into this issue. If the member is suggesting we should duplicate that, I think he is talking about wasting taxpayers' money by such duplication.

Mr. Rae: The minister knows perfectly well there is no royal commission to discuss this question. He knows the commission of inquiry that has been established is dealing with a completely different question from this question of retail prices. The minister should stop the smokescreen, stop the smoke and mirrors. It has nothing to do with what is going on today.

With respect to retail prices, does the minister know whether the oil companies have been phoning the dealers? We are not singling out the dealers at all; we are singling out the oil companies. We are looking at the oil companies and the impact they are having on retail prices. Is the minister prepared to look at the question of retail pricing and price practices in this province, right across the province—northern Ontario, southern Ontario, isolated communities and urban communities—and to come up with a fair deal for the consumers of this province? Is he prepared to do that or is he not?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: I think the preface to the question really was, "Are you going to stop beating your wife?" The issue really is—

Hon Mr. Drea: Are you?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: I never did beat her, so that is not a problem for me. I do not know whether the minister—no, he does not do that either. My wife beats me up on occasion.

First, I do not start out with the assumption of the member that the dealers and all the other people involved in the distribution of petroleum products are out to gouge people. I think by and large we have been well served by the process that is in place.

Mr. Ruston: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary is with regard to the answer the minister gave to the first question of the leader of the New Democratic Party about retailers setting the

price. Is the minister not aware that retailers have nothing to do with setting the price, that the company calls them and tells them what to sell it for?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, I am aware there are company policies. I am also aware that the dealers do have some options with respect to levels.

Mr. Swart: Mr. Speaker, the minister knows very well that neither I nor my leader is suggesting it was the gasoline retail dealers who were gouging the public. The minister must know that the price war was manipulated by the major oil companies—

Mr. Speaker: Question, please.

Mr. Swart: —to put the squeeze on both the independent distributors and the independent dealers. Independent dealers, by and large, were not getting the same low price from the big oil refining companies that the direct outlet or commission agents were; thus, they could not compete and they lost business. One of the companies that is the worst at squeezing out the independent retailers is Suncor. It has a conscious policy now of not renewing licences and then of going into direct selling itself.

If the minister cares at all about the small independent business people in this province, will he do a comprehensive study of the current practices and their effects on the small retail and distributing independents?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is any reason for anyone to doubt the concern this government has about the small independents and the dealers and consumers in this province. As I said, I do not start out with the same presumptions those members do, that everybody is always out to gouge everybody else.

CHRONIC CARE FACILITY

Mr. Wrye: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Health about some of the announcements he made in Windsor yesterday regarding chronic care facilities in Riverview Hospital. I want to welcome the \$1 million he has pledged to keep Riverview Hospital safe with respect to fire standards, at least in the interim. It seems the minister is now a latter-day convert to the need for a new chronic care facility, which we on this side have been pushing for more than a decade.

Given the timetable he has outlined to the hospitals and to the health council to come up with a plan for a new unit, what is the minister's

timetable for construction of the facility? Will he provide funding for the capital construction of this facility as soon as the new plan is in place this fall?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, as soon as an agreement is reached we can begin the normal planning process, and the funding will be on our usual format.

Mr. Wrye: The minister knows full well that the normal planning process is one of five, six and up to 10 years. We do not have 10 more years. To upgrade that facility is going to cost \$9 million in the next two or three years, and surely when we are talking about \$30 million for a new facility we ought to put money where it well belongs.

The minister is quick to place the blame on the hospitals for this, but I want to read from a document I have that reports on the position of the ministry. Dr. Dyer sent a letter to the council last fall saying the figures would indicate, with respect to the need for a new chronic care hospital, that at this time Windsor cannot justify a new chronic care hospital until the conditions stipulated by the ministry can be reached. He went on to say that capital dollars are not available to fund a new chronic care hospital. However, the ministry is supportive of private funding that would also incorporate operating costs.

Will the minister give us a commitment today that this government will provide the financial backing for the construction and operation of a new facility so that our new chronic care hospital is not maintained at the whim of the private marketplace but is part of the overall health care system in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: When I was in Windsor yesterday I predicted the honourable member and his colleagues would jump as quickly as possible to try to take all the credit for what this government had decided to do in the Windsor area and they never let me down.

Mr. Wrye: We won't take credit for that firetrap.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: In any case, let me make it clear the statement I made a moment ago stands. When there is agreement and the planning process is undertaken, it does not take seven, eight or nine years. Given the point they are at in Windsor, I would expect to have the facility rebuilt; if everything goes on schedule and if agreement is reached this October, perhaps it will be commenced in another year and a half and completed three or four years from

today, depending on the size of the project. Our funding will come in place as always.

I might take this opportunity to say to the member and to his colleague the member for Essex North (Mr. Ruston) that the comments I made about them were tongue in cheek; the audience appreciated that.

Mr. Wrye: That's not what we heard.

10:50 a.m.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Oh, yes, it is. I noted for them that I knew the member would have been there had he been in town. His friends will tell him that.

Mr. Cooke: Mr. Speaker, the people of Windsor know who is committed to health care. They also know it was this government that fought for three or four years to try to close the only chronic care facility, Riverview, that we have in the city of Windsor. It was this government that tried from 1975 to 1979 to close that hospital.

We need these chronic care beds urgently in the city of Windsor in view of the backup into both nursing home and unregulated rest home and active treatment beds. It is a problem and is costing the taxpayers money. Also, we need the jobs in the building sector. This facility simply has to be built in the next few years. Why does this government not accelerate that capital works project and build the chronic care hospital that is so desperately needed in the city of Windsor?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I have not seen the Windsor paper this morning but I must have done fairly well yesterday. I have now had three of those members up. If the member for Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. Newman) will get up, it will be a clean sweep.

In order to get it on the record, the member asked me why we do not begin to build the hospital as quickly as possible. My answer is simple. We have indicated that October is the absolute, last cutoff date for all the hospitals and the medical community to come to some agreement, so the ministry can commence its part of the exercise which is to rebuild the facility.

Might I say that on the open-line program in Windsor yesterday morning, I quite enjoyed taking a call from the member's mother who asked some questions he had fed her. She did not identify herself, but she did a credible job in trying to put the New Democratic Party's case forward.

CLOSURE OF CLARKE IRWIN.

Mr. Allen: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for

the Minister of Industry and Trade. As the minister will know, this past week saw an important event in the history of Canadian publishing and the survival of Canadian culture, namely the closure of the publisher Clarke Irwin and Co. Ltd. in this province.

He is also aware there have been two other closures in recent months, that there are 14 other institutions of the same kind being supported by the Ontario Development Corp., and that McClelland and Stewart is in a cash-short situation. Yet the minister is reported to have said, in response to this situation, that receivership was simply one way the province had of protecting its investment.

Given the enormous influence of Canadian publishers in the expression of the traditions, ideals, insights, values and aspirations from which the fabric of our cultural life is woven, does the minister intend to persist in viewing this case, and those of the 14 other publishers supported by ODC, with this simple trust-in-business fundamentalism? Does he propose to protect, in some other fashion I hope, the immense cultural investment we have in Canadian publishing, or is he simply going to place Price Waterhouse patrols in all the corridors and change the locks?

Hon. Mr. Walker: Mr. Speaker, the Ontario Development Corp. is involved with a number of publishers, but in particular it was involved with the Clarke Irwin company. There was a substantial loan there. In fact, it was a guarantee of \$1.5 million which basically grew to \$1.6 million.

The bank, in essence, called the loan on it and, with our guarantee, we were required to respond and provide the funds that were asked; \$1.5 million of taxpayers' money is not something to be trifled with. We tried to extend with the company as long as possible. We worked with them. We massaged the situation. We tried to do everything humanly possible to cause that firm to come to a situation of profitability. We had projections made by the firm that suggested it could have come to a profitable situation, but nothing was happening and the taxpayers' money was being jeopardized in the process.

It behooved us to respond in a way that recognized the trust the public had given us in terms of its money. This money was there. It is the taxpayers' money. We must protect it. In this case, after extending month after month—in fact, after extending for a period of close to a year—we had no choice but to go in and put the

firm into receivership. There was absolutely no choice whatsoever. Anybody assessing this from a financial point of view would probably have said, "Why did you not move in sooner?"

Having done that, I think it is fair to say, and the Minister of Citizenship and Culture (Mr. McCaffrey) would support me in this and may wish to offer some observations, we hope that from this receivership will come a restructuring from a financial point of view with an infusion of new moneys, with some new partnership participation in the process, perhaps even with a sale of the operation. There are four or five potential purchasers. From all that, we might then have a reasonable book industry—a reasonable industry in this particular case—that will again make sure the taxpayers' money is protected properly. I do not think the members would want anything less.

Mr. Allen: I am not asking the minister to trifle with taxpayers' money. I suggest perhaps the government might use some of it more effectively and efficiently. Presumably the minister is quite familiar with the basic economic facts of the Canadian publishing industry. Canadian-controlled firms spend three times as great a percentage of their net sales on bank charges and interest as foreign firms. He is aware of the kinds of supports he has recited to me from the Ontario Development Corp. and the kind of problem that Clarke Irwin specifically got into.

But is he aware that the Ministry of Education, through its book-purchase plan, subsidizes school book purchases from Circular 14 to the tune of over \$2 million a year? Despite the advantage that foreign-owned firms have in the field of book imports in this province and in this country, the Ministry of Education persists in giving them equal access to the book-purchase plan and they now appear to dominate it. Clarke Irwin has been one of the losers in that squeeze.

Will the minister press the Ministry of Education to amend the terms of the book-purchase plan so that the books in question may be purchased only through Canadian-owned publishers' agencies, as happens in at least one neighbouring province? Surely that is the kind of affirmative action his ministry and the Ministry of Education ought to be undertaking with respect to Canadian publications.

Hon. Mr. Walker: I simply reiterate that there is a lot of money invested in this company. I will certainly pass on to the Minister of Education (Miss Stephenson) the comments the member for Hamilton West has made. She is quite

capable of looking after her ministry and recognizing the requirements and priorities within it. She will do a fine job on it and, if it is in the interests of the public, she will take into account some of the observations the member has made.

In respect of this loan, in April 1982—that was a year ago—the guarantee was extended a further six months. In September 1982 it was extended on a month-by-month basis. There was absolutely nothing else that could be done. The public will judge us on the basis of this and will say we acted prudently under the circumstances. I think the member will be satisfied once he sees the final outcome of the situation.

Mr. Conway: Mr. Speaker, I ask the minister to forget about the money and just to pretend Clarke Irwin is Minaki or Foster Advertising or Camp Associates and he might not be so nervous about the dollars involved. Has the minister personally involved himself, together with the culture minister, and met with the principals involved, particularly those at Clarke Irwin, to make them aware of the kind of framework of government policy the minister is prepared to support to ensure this particularly valuable cultural and economic operation will be allowed to continue in Ontario? Will he personally involve himself, together with the culture minister, to make sure the principals are aware of their support?

Hon. Mr. Walker: Mr. Speaker, let me begin by saying that everybody wants to have the company saved in the process. Everybody wants to have the company survive and the jobs survive, and that is something on which this government and this ministry, and the Ministry of Citizenship and Culture, are particularly intent.

On May 16, 1983, Dr. William Clarke, who is the president of Clarke Irwin, met with the Minister of Citizenship and Culture. In addition, my officials have been meeting without fail over months and months on this issue. The lead minister in this case is the Minister of Citizenship and Culture. He has been meeting directly with them. If he feels my presence is required, I am certainly prepared to take part.

In this case, the Ontario Development Corp. is acting on behalf of Citizenship and Culture in response to the financial side of the issue. There is no question this government will meet its obligations, that the government members and ministers will meet as required to resolve this. There has been no reluctance on their part to be part of a solution.

11 a.m.

NIAGARA RIVER WATER QUALITY

Mr. Kerrio: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Deputy Premier who attended, along with me, a public meeting in Lewiston, New York. He showed his anger and disappointment that there was pollution going on in the lower Niagara River. He made a comment that he did not want to see another drop of any kind of pollutant going into that water. For that, I commend him.

Now I am asking, will the minister and his government join myself and many groups in Niagara, such as the Preservation of Agricultural Land Society, Operation Clean Niagara, Mr. Oleksuik from Chippawa and many concerned citizens, in resisting in every possible way the setting up of a chemical dump site on those farm lands in Niagara?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, just to make sure I understand the question, is the member making reference to the reports that have been recently made public by the Ontario Waste Management Corp.?

If I have understood that particular report, that area is not on that list. I do not think Dr. Chant indicated the region of Niagara was part of the preferred list or at the top of the list. I may have misunderstood that, but that is what I thought Dr. Chant had indicated in his report. The member makes reference to our joint and mutual interest in the quality of water in the river. Certainly since that very historic night in which we both participated, there has been a lot of things happen.

Over a period of time the member has asked questions of the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Norton) and provided him with an opportunity to give progress reports there. I think progress is being made because the people generally are quite supportive of initiatives being taken there. We realize how we are benefiting in our area by the involvement of so many well-meaning people who have rallied around this cause to keep these issues very prominent and to give them a very high profile.

The member knows as well that the work being done by Dr. Chant and that particular group has taken into account all sorts of factors with respect to the ultimate proper site. I think we always have to keep before us, and it has always been part of the debate with respect to this issue, that there has to be some place found where we can properly treat these very dangerous wastes. Obviously no final decision will be taken until everyone is completely satisfied that

wherever it is to be finally located, that work can be done in a very safe and proper way.

Mr. Kerrio: The fact they even considered the Cayuga dump site on the banks of the Grand River frightens me, and the fact Dr. Chant and his group have not decided there should be a minimal distance from any water course for the disposition of this kind of chemical site concerns me greatly.

The fact some people are using the not-in-my-backyard syndrome is not what motivates me. My concern is, first, all of the pollution in the river; second, having an American railroad that cuts right across the peninsula to take toxic chemicals from Niagara Falls, New York, to Detroit; third, having added to that trucks bringing in chemicals to this dump site, and finally, and probably most significant of all, the fact that they would be using some of the prime agricultural land in Canada would suggest to me that we need all the help we can get to resist it, because of these facts that I bring to the minister.

I am wondering if all those points have been considered. I am afraid they have not. That is why I am asking for the minister's personal intervention and an appeal to his cabinet that Niagara should never be considered for this kind of site.

Mr. Speaker: I believe the question was, "Have all these points been taken into consideration?"

Hon. Mr. Welch: The Minister of the Environment and I were in the constituency of Brock about a week ago meeting with high school students, which provided a forum for some discussion on this and related issues. Some of the representatives of these other groups were there as well and the minister was provided with an opportunity to meet with them and to hear their concerns.

I think we have always got to keep very clearly in mind—surely there is no dispute in so far as any member of this House is concerned—that we have to find a site for the treatment of these dangerous wastes. They have to be treated.

I heard Dr. Chant, as did the member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Kerrio), as he was discussing his report within the last few days, indicate that the waste management corporation is taking into consideration all the points to which the member quite rightly draws our attention. Ultimately a site has to be found so we can treat these chemicals in a responsible way. I know that has been the consistent position of the

member for Niagara Falls during these entire discussions. Where that site will be obviously will be the result of careful determination, taking into account all the matters to which the member makes reference, the ultimate matter being the safety and the health of the people of the province.

Mr. Swart: Mr. Speaker, recognizing that something like only four per cent of the chemical waste is generated in the Niagara region, does the Deputy Premier not think it would be something of an imposition for the people of Niagara to have to take the disposal plant for all of southern Ontario? Does he not think it would be more appropriate for that disposal plant to be located in Brampton where there is a site that meets all the criteria?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I am quite satisfied that ultimately a very responsible group, chaired by Dr. Chant, will take all these factors into consideration in coming to a decision which will be in the best interests of the people of this province.

At the next opportunity, I will be very happy to mention to the member for Brampton (Mr. Davis) the member's interest in his constituency.

TTC SAFETY STANDARDS

Mr. Wildman: Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Ramsay) regarding the Toronto Transit Commission's failure to implement inquest juries' recommendations.

It is almost one full year since the death of Mr. R. Achong, an electrician who was killed while relamping light fixtures at track level in the Toronto Transit Commission subway during operating hours on June 1, 1982, and it has been five months since the inquest. Can the Minister of Labour explain why the TTC still has not installed red flashing lights; why the TTC continues to refuse to include additional flagmen in all track-level work crews during so-called revenue hours; why the TTC has not carried out the safety training program for all employees working at track level; and why the TTC has refused to develop a nonvisual warning system, all of which measures were recommended by the coroner's jury?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, I am aware of several meetings that were held with officials of my ministry and also with the officials of the TTC. I must admit I felt that from the information which had been provided to me the matters had been resolved and the appropriate action was being taken. If that is not the case I

will certainly be more than pleased to look into it and to report back to the honourable member.

Mr. Wildman: The TTC has installed a large red light but not a red flashing light, as was recommended by the coroner's jury. Considering the failure of the TTC to implement the measures that the coroner's jury stated were necessary to improve safety for track-level crews, why has the minister not intervened to protect the rights of workers to refuse unsafe work? There were 19 employees who lost three days' pay for refusing to work at track level without a red flashing warning light being installed. Why is the minister, through his meetings with the TTC, co-operating in stalling on the establishment of proper health and safety committees?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: I cannot accept the observation that there has been stalling on the part of the ministry. The opposite has been true, in so far as the information with which I am familiar is concerned.

I will have to look into the matter he has brought up in respect to the refusal to work and the fact that salary was withheld from these men. These are points on which I will be happy to report back.

11:10 a.m.

Mr. Wrye: Mr. Speaker, when the minister reports back to the House, will he report not only in general terms on the refusal to work and the problems that arose out of that, but on each and every one of the recommendations of the coroner's jury and exactly what the TTC plans to do? If his ministry does not intend to force the company to implement those recommendations, will he tell us on what basis the ministry is agreeing with the TTC?

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

CONSTRUCTION LIEN ACT

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, with your indulgence, I have the answer to a previously asked question.

On May 2 last, the member for Oshawa (Mr. Breaugh) posed a very important question to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Elgie) regarding the Construction Lien Act. The problem raised by the member for Oshawa relates particularly to subsection 80(5) dealing with the priority of liens over mortgages registered subsequent to the commencement of an improvement.

When a purchaser of a new home who has not had the house built for him or her, and therefore

is not an owner under the act, closes the transaction, advances the purchase price and receives a conveyance from the builder, it is clear that if no liens are registered at the time and the purchaser has no written notice of a lien, the interest of the purchaser has priority over any lien.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: The answer of the Attorney General is a four-page prepared text. I wonder if you might stop the clock on question period. We would certainly be glad to have this statement made as a ministerial statement.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: That will be fine.

Mr. Speaker: I am not aware of the length of the answer.

Mr. Nixon: I am bringing it to your attention.

Mr. Speaker: Do we have the concurrence of the House to revert to statements?

Agreed to.

STATEMENT BY THE MINISTRY

CONSTRUCTION LIEN ACT

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, when a purchaser has no written notice of a lien, the interest of the purchaser has priority over any lien, and that is the effect of subsection 80(6).

It has long been and, in my opinion is now the law that a mortgage arranged by the purchaser who is not an owner, advanced and registered at closing, also has priority over liens which have not been registered. It was not our intention to confiscate part of the interest of mortgagees lending to purchasers. The lien has a right over the interest and the property of the person who had the improvement made.

While several highly regarded lawyers have given the same opinion as I have just expressed, doubt apparently remains in the minds of some lenders. They have not been advancing 10 or more per cent of the price on closing. Some purchasers of new homes have been forced to arrange interim financing for a period of up to 60 days from closing. Not only could this be harmful to the individual purchaser, but it could also put a cloud over purchasing a home and might thereby harm the construction industry which is so important to the economic health of the province.

I could refer the interpretation of the subsection to the courts and wait for clarification. However, that would not be the desire of the government or, I think, of the members opposite.

While I had hoped to wait for at least a year before making amendments to the act, I believe there should be amendments in the near future to clarify the intention of the legislation.

The effect of the amendments I will bring forward will make it clear that a mortgage of a purchaser's interest in a new home is not subject to the priorities of subsections 80(2) or 80(5). These amendments will be retroactive to April 2 when the act came into force. In addition, the conveyancing bar has requested there be legislative clarification of when a purchaser of a new home becomes an owner and thereby becomes responsible for holdback, and these amendments will clarify this issue.

I trust the lenders in the province will act on this statement of intention to bring forward legislation. It is not necessary and it is undesirable for a lender to a purchaser to be concerned about the priority of liens under subsections 80(2) or 80(5). Because of my wish to consult those involved, a ministry official will be meeting with lawyers representing lenders to work out the details of these amendments. Representatives of contractors and labour will also be consulted.

To avoid misunderstanding, I want to emphasize that the principles of the act and holdback security will not be reconsidered in connection with these proposed amendments. Holdback security in the present form will remain until all segments of the construction industry can agree on a better method for protecting the vital interests of those who supply services and material to improve real property.

Mr. Breagh: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the speed with which the Attorney General has reacted to the problem. He is not known for speed.

There is one little problem which remains. In my area, and I take it in other areas of Ontario, there are people who have had to get the money and put it in a trust account. That is one thing not mentioned in the statement the Attorney General made today. Would he give some consideration to such people who have already paid a financial privilege and in some cases lost the ability to purchase or complete a home because of these problems? Would he give that some consideration as well?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I am not sure what we can do about that. I will discuss the matter with my senior advisors.

ORAL QUESTIONS

(continued)

FAIR EXCHANGE RATES

Mr. Eakins: I would like to address my question to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation. As the minister knows, millions of dollars are spent in attracting people to visit and discover Ontario. Since this is our first long weekend, would he comment on his ministry's activity to make sure the fair exchange program is in effect in Ontario and that fair exchange on United States currency will be recognized in this province?

Hon. Mr. Baetz: As the honourable member knows, the implementation or application of a fair exchange program would fall outside the mandate of my ministry. In the Ministry of Tourism and Recreation we are doing what we can—that is to advise incoming tourists, particularly Americans, that they should be making their exchanges at official exchange places. If they do not heed our constant advice and counselling and run into a situation where they do not feel they are getting a fair exchange, unfortunately, that is their problem. It is not something I and my ministry can correct.

I want to assure the member and all those here that we do try as well and as comprehensively as we can to alert incoming tourists to make sure they exchange at officially recognized exchanges. We have never heard of any problem when they do that.

Mr. Eakins: What is the ministry doing to monitor the situation? The minister works very closely with Tourism Ontario and hotels. He has recently received one letter I know of in particular about people who booked into a hotel in the evening and could not get a fair exchange on their money.

The minister might also take a look at the Toronto Transit Commission which the government subsidizes. The sign in the ticket windows states one will only receive 15 per cent up to a maximum of \$20. Is the minister monitoring those facilities to which the government contributes taxpayers' funds in this province?

Hon. Mr. Baetz: I can assure the honourable member that is exactly what we do. As the minister I do not get many complaints from American tourists about having received an unfair exchange rate. However, when I do hear from these people, each complaint is followed up individually. Where we find a motel, hotel,

restaurant or whatever that tends to be gouging tourists on exchange rates we ask the local travel organization to follow through and exercise some discipline.

A lot of self-policing can and does take place in Tourism Ontario and some of the other tourist associations. Certainly, if I hear from a disgruntled American tourist saying he has been dealt with unfairly on the exchange rate, we do follow through on that. We also do it through ongoing programs of advising travel associations and so on.

11:20 a.m.

OVERCROWDED CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES

Mr. Philip: Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Minister of Correctional Services concerning the decline in the capacity of his institutions in Metro to accommodate inmates, with the closing of minimum security facilities to the point where the facilities in Metro designed for 628 inmates are now holding over 1,500. Is the minister not concerned that the conditions caused by overcrowding have become so dangerous that leaders of the 3,100 guards in Metropolitan Toronto East, Metropolitan Toronto West and the Don Jail have instructed their members not to intervene when violence breaks out in those institutions?

Would the minister agree with the statement by Lyn Hooker, president of the jail workers of Metropolitan Toronto West, that one of these days there is going to be a blow-up and when it does come we will not be looking at one or two dead but maybe 30 or 40? What is the minister going to do about it?

Hon. Mr. Leluk: Mr. Speaker, I have spoken many times in this House, as the member for Etobicoke knows, about what my ministry has been doing in relation to providing the additional bed spaces required, particularly in the Metro Toronto area where we have the most serious problem of overcrowding. We have been addressing that.

In the last 11-month period we have created some 150 bed spaces at Mimico Correctional Centre by upgrading that facility from a minimum security facility to a medium security facility. We have opened the fifth floor at the Hamilton-Wentworth Detention Centre, which created an additional 60 bed spaces there. We have put forward a long-range accommodation plan that calls for a new maximum security

facility for the Golden Horseshoe area that would provide an additional 500 bed spaces.

Mr. Martel: Why don't you use Burwash again?

Hon. Mr. Leluk: Pardon?

Mr. Speaker: Never mind the interjections, please.

Hon. Mr. Leluk: I am trying to answer the question of the member for Etobicoke (Mr. Philip) and I ask the members opposite to give me that opportunity.

In regard to the members of our correctional staff who have been asked to stand by and not to intervene, we have certain guidelines and policies in our ministry that we expect our correctional staff to follow at all times. They do this on a day-to-day basis and this is what is expected of them.

RESPONSE TO WRITTEN QUESTIONS

Mr. Nixon: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: A number of my colleagues have brought to my attention their concern with the lack of application of standing order 81 and the answering of written questions on behalf of the ministry. The Speaker is aware that on Tuesday of this week, the honourable government House leader tabled a very large number of answers. On examination, most of them appeared not to be answers at all.

There is some complaint that too many questions are asked and that they are too complex. I can assure the Speaker there is no intention on our part to jam up the so-called government machinery, but I would like to say that answers to some of these questions have been pending for seven months, since last October, and they are carried over on the order paper if they are not answered in the interim period.

It seems to me that if the government feels it cannot deal with this material, under the standing orders it has the right to refuse to answer. I suppose we would object to that as well. But the argument that our research complement in the library and estimates and so on are the places where the answers might be available is not satisfactory.

I felt, Mr. Speaker, you should be aware that the government, in our view, is not living up to the spirit of standing order 81. If government members want to say to this House in their answers that they refuse to provide an answer for reasons they think good and sufficient, there is not much we can do about it but complain.

But I say to you, Mr. Speaker, they have not done that. The answers have been pending for seven months and I believe it is your job, or I would respectfully submit to you it is your responsibility, to see that the standing order is lived up to both in its letter and in its spirit. The information should be put before this House.

Mr. Speaker: I am sure the government House leader (Mr. Wells) has paid close attention to your submission and in turn, will contact his colleagues to ask them to live up to the intention and the spirit and the letter of standing order 81.

PETITION

CONVERSION OF RENTAL UNITS

Mr. Ruprecht: Mr. Speaker, I have a petition signed by many tenants across Toronto, which reads:

"To the Honourable Lieutenant Governor and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"We, the undersigned, beg leave to petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario that immediate steps be taken to protect us against unscrupulous landlords who evict tenants in order to create furnished hotel-like suites. This change not only eliminates valuable rental units, but these hotel-like suites will destroy our community by creating giant flophouses in our neighbourhoods."

MOTION

HOUSE SITTINGS

Hon. Mr. Wells moved that when this House adjourns today, it stand adjourned until Tuesday next, May 24, at 2 p.m.

Motion agreed to.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

ANDONALD ENTERPRISES LIMITED ACT

Ms. Fish moved, seconded by Mr. Robinson, first reading of Bill Pr29, An Act to revive Andonald Enterprises Limited.

Motion agreed to.

BERNARD BETEL CENTRE FOR CREATIVE LIVING ACT

Mr. Cousens moved, seconded by Ms. Fish, first reading of Bill Pr20, An Act respecting the Bernard Betel Centre for Creative Living.

Motion agreed to.

11:30 a.m.

CLASS ACTIONS ACT

Mr. Swart moved, seconded by Mr. Cassidy, first reading of Bill 47, An Act to provide for Class Actions.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Swart: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to provide a statutory procedure whereby one or more persons may sue a defendant in the form of a class action. The bill is designed to achieve this purpose by permitting a person who wishes to sue on behalf of a class to apply for a court order authorizing the class action. Once the order is obtained, the action proceeds as a class action, and the final judgement binds all members of the class except those who have been excluded, as well as the parties to the action.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

ESTIMATES

Hon. Mr. Wells moved, seconded by Hon. Mr. Gregory, resolution 8.

Reading dispensed with [see Votes and Proceedings].

Motion agreed to.

House in committee of supply.

ESTIMATES, MINISTRY OF GOVERNMENT SERVICES

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: Mr. Chairman, I have an opening statement.

It is a distinct honour and a privilege for me to rise in this chamber to present the Ministry of Government Services expenditure estimates for the year 1983-84. I am sure each and every member of the Legislature believes, as I do, that we are very proud and very fortunate to be able to serve the people of Ontario in the productive and sincere manner that our system of government has provided for the past 200 years.

As a farmer, businessman and politician, I can only say that I regard myself as perhaps the most fortunate of all to be able to stand in this historic chamber for yet another year and provide the members on both sides of the House with the expenditure plans for the ministry. It is truly a great personal honour for me.

Before I proceed with the detailed discussions and debate on the various votes in our estimates, I would like to offer a brief opening statement, which I believe will provide the members of the House with a perspective on my ministry and on our approach and plans for 1983-84.

In one respect my ministry is no different from any of the other ministries of the provincial government; that is, we were founded and built on the need to provide service to the people of Ontario. Service is our mandate; service is what this government is all about. In my humble opinion, the leadership role that the Ministry of Government Services has taken to provide our sister ministries, agencies, boards and commissions and the people of Ontario with government services is second to none.

If I were speaking from a private sector perspective, I might say the Ministry of Government Services is really more than two dozen businesses rolled into one. We are in the construction business, the furniture business, the moving business; we are printers, architects, real estate agents and business administrators. Our resources extend from computer and telecommunications expertise to running one of the most efficient mail services in the country.

Most important of all, we are the ministry of people: people who are dedicated to public service; people who are constantly looking for new and improved methods of serving the taxpayers of this province. I believe we all have a real role, a real responsibility, to address the most pressing concern of our society today. That concern is employment. We must do everything in our power to stimulate employment opportunities and to provide employment incentives to aid the thousands of Ontario men and women now out of work.

The Ministry of Government Services continues to encourage job creation in the private sector. It has been and will continue to be our philosophy that we can best serve Ontarians through the privatization of many of the services we provide. In 1983-84 we will create an estimated 6,556 jobs in the private sector in our capital allocations and repairs program through expenditures of some \$76.8 million across Ontario. When I say "across Ontario" I mean just that: we will be looking at every corner of this province to offer the needed economic stimulation to get people back on the job.

Last year, through the Board of Industrial Leadership and Development program, we were able to create an estimated 1,400 jobs through \$10.4 million in construction, repair and alteration projects. This year we hope to create employment for 1,200 men and women through the \$50 million in BILD expenditures in capital construction alone.

Further job creation initiatives will be realized through the Canada-Ontario employment

development program. We already have three projects approved to date that will provide 278 job opportunities through the expenditure of some \$821,000. As an update on that, just a few minutes ago we found out that we had been granted another \$500,000 in that program; so there will be even more jobs created. We will be seeking, as I will mention later, approval for more throughout the fiscal year.

Our efforts to stimulate employment in the private sector include increased privatization of many of the services my ministry provides. In 1983-84 we estimate spending \$87 million on contracts in the private sector to design, operate and maintain government buildings across Ontario.

We are also taking initiatives to inform Ontario businesses of how they can sell to their government. To increase opportunities for access to government markets, we will be involved in trade shows and will participate in exhibits. We will explore new and improved ways of communicating with the business community.

I am firmly convinced that the results will be economic stimulation and the benefit will be further creation of employment in the private sector right across Ontario.

11:40 a.m.

The Ministry of Government Services has constantly been looking at methods of saving dollars while at the same time improving service. Through a reorganization of government office space in downtown Toronto, we expect to save the people of Ontario \$10 million during the next three years and some \$60 million over the next decade.

This Metro Toronto initiative also kicks off our program to reduce all government office accommodation by 10 per cent across Ontario. When we consider the fact that the Ministry of Government Services holds responsibility for approximately 11 million square feet of office space in this province, this initiative alone will save us many millions of dollars.

Our government continues its leadership in the area of energy conservation and cost savings and my ministry is proud to play a vital part in that program. Over the past six years, we have reduced energy consumption by 25 per cent. That is a saving of \$27 million—I used the example yesterday—enough to heat and light 54,000 homes. In this fiscal year, we expect further savings as we continue to practise and promote this worthwhile effort.

We have been able to accomplish these economies through new building designs, through

energy-efficient retrofits of existing buildings and through co-operative programs with the Ministry of Energy aimed at educating our employees in the area of conservation.

One excellent example of the energy-efficient design is the new headquarters for the Ministry of Revenue in Oshawa. Another is the Macdonald-Cartier building in Kingston; yet another is the one we opened yesterday, the new courthouse in St. Catharines. These are all well-designed people buildings, and all operate at a fraction of the energy costs we experienced a few years ago.

There are other areas of cost savings we have identified and are proceeding to take advantage of. As one example, let me point out that in the past we disposed of outdated government records through incineration. The cost to the government of Ontario was approximately \$140,000 per year. We are currently going through a system of shredding and recycling under strict security measures. Through this system we will not only save that \$140,000 but also show a return this year of \$12,000 through the sale of this recycled paper.

Use of new electronic innovations, such as a minicomputer in our collection services section, will increase our revenue by a projected \$700,000 in this fiscal year. Through our accommodation division, the reorganization of our field offices across Ontario will produce a 7.5 per cent increase in productivity and service, while actually saving money through a six per cent reduction in staff as a result of some amalgamation and the normal attrition process.

The Ministry of Government Services places great emphasis on its human resources, its people. We believe our managers should be encouraged to manage. Through the reorganization of our field offices, more and more decisions will be made at the local level. We believe our human resource programs are providing the knowledge, the training and the encouragement that will provide us with a strong foundation of dedicated men and women to carry out the programs of today and address the challenges of tomorrow.

We are continuing to place emphasis on the career development of women within our ministry. Women now hold 32.5 per cent of all positions in the Ministry of Government Services, up from 31 per cent just a year ago. On our senior management committee, three women are involved in senior policy discussions and decisions being made at MGS. We are committed to all programs designed to offer equal

opportunity for advancement and career development of all our employees and we will continue to pursue those objectives.

Earlier in this statement, I mentioned some of the initiatives we are taking to encourage the business community to sell to their government. I would like to take a moment to share with the House a number of purchasing policies and programs.

In these times of constraint and tight money, purchasing has become a real challenge for both the buyer and the seller. To say competition in the marketplace is fierce would be putting it mildly. I am pleased to report that my ministry's one-window collective purchasing program for common-use products and services exceeded \$50 million in the last fiscal year. That is a saving of \$13 million, and I fully expect us to advance that saving even further in 1983-84.

My ministry is firmly committed to the buy-Canadian policy. That policy is solidly entrenched in all our purchasing activities. I have taken a strong personal interest in this commitment, as has my entire staff. The result is a continuous intensive review of the ministry's sources of supply. I am sure the honourable members will be interested to know that 100 per cent of some 1,100 MGS stock items are purchased in Canada and 95 per cent are manufactured in Canada. We will continue our commitment to the buy-Canadian program because in MGS we know Canadian products mean Canadian jobs.

To assist us in achieving that goal, we will be appointing a full-time agent in our purchasing services branch with the responsibility to identify and promote further opportunities for import replacement with Canadian-made products. The purchasing of Canadian-made products means more private sector initiative, and that means more jobs.

I might also take this opportunity to mention a number of other initiatives we are taking in the area of corporate services.

We are now providing telephone translation services to our client ministries for more rapid response to our francophone citizens in Ontario. By using new approaches to take full advantage of the postal rates, we were able to save \$800,000 in mailing costs last year. Our publication services are providing a looseleaf version of the Highway Traffic Act; this new approach will allow faster and more economical updates. Leadership in records management will see dollar savings and increased retrieval efficiency through privatization in this very important area.

These are but a few of the opportunities we are taking to improve service. We have not been asleep at the switch when it comes to technology either.

My ministry has recently installed an audio teleconferencing capability which will bring people together via the telephone in up to 14 locations outside Metro Toronto. Using intercity network lines, this service not only will save us long-distance charges but also will offer an opportunity for government employees to conduct their business in a rapid and more productive manner.

11:50 a.m.

Video teleconferencing is another initiative my ministry has taken to offer a more streamlined and effective method of communications throughout government. To date we have established video conferencing centres in Toronto, Thunder Bay, Sudbury and Oshawa. Additional centres are planned in this fiscal year for Kingston and Sault Ste. Marie. This system has all the benefits of audio conference with the added bonus of face-to-face dialogue, resulting in considerable savings in government travel and accommodation.

A new computer data base will allow our switchboard operators to provide instant response to calls requesting information on a specific service this government provides. All members will be interested to know that it will also give us a current electronic government telephone directory.

Improving the telephone system in the northern regions of this province has been a major goal of our ministry. Funds allocated in this fiscal year will see improvements in that northern telephone service.

On the subject of intercity telephone lines, this service saved the government \$7 million last year and handled more than 15 million calls. I am sure the members of the House are aware of the many improvements we have made in the intercity lines right across this province in the past year. There will be more, and I shall share these new initiatives with the House as they are put into operation.

Before I leave the subject of telecommunications, I would mention the pilot project we have in place at the Ministry of Government Services to aid us in determining the most effective use of our telephones.

The "datapulse" system we have installed on a trial basis will show what the peak periods are for incoming calls. It will determine the number of calls placed and received from a specific

telephone, and it will establish how long the caller had to wait for the telephone to be answered. These data not only will allow us to determine dollar-saving opportunities but, equally important, it will also offer us opportunities to improve service to our clients through more effective staff scheduling.

New Ministry of Government Services computer centres will offer improved facilities and state of the art service to the Ministry of Revenue, which has relocated to Oshawa, and the head office of the Ontario health insurance plan, relocating to Kingston. To provide the expertise and support for these services, my ministry will be relocating 50 employees in our computer and telecommunications service division to Kingston early this summer.

We are not only looking towards the external application of computer services. We are a progressive-thinking ministry which is also using new internal methods for improvement of services and savings of administration dollars. We plan to share this knowledge with our sister ministries throughout the government. We hope this sharing and leadership in the electronic age will return our dollars and time invested many times over.

This Legislative Building has been a great source of pride to the people of Ontario. I take real pleasure in playing some small role in ensuring that we have a continuing program designed to retain the dignity, heritage and security it conveys to all of us.

We are also in the midst of designing a gift shop to be located in the main foyer of the Legislative Building. The number of requests we have had from visitors to Queen's Park suggests this type of service will be extremely well received, not only by Ontarians but also by visitors from all over the world.

In the past 12 months or so we have provided improved accommodation for our sister ministries in everything from fish hatcheries to multi-purpose office towers. We have opened facilities in the northern, eastern and western areas of Ontario. These facilities will allow the ministries to offer the people of Ontario up-to-date services in modern and efficient facilities.

In this fiscal year we will be officially opening a state of the art office complex housing the Ministry of Revenue in Oshawa. The Macdonald-Cartier building will provide a new home for the head office of the Ontario health insurance plan in Kingston. Ground-breaking and construction will begin on a \$50-million Ottawa courthouse. The St. Catharines courthouse, which I men-

tioned before, was opened earlier and will provide a quality of service not possible in the former facility. Our accommodation division will continue to upgrade and respond to the needs of our client ministries and of Ontarians right across the province.

Some honourable members might recall that things got a little cool around here last winter when the boiler failed and shut down our heating system. We are now hooked into the Toronto District Heating Corp. steam plant and will be providing a safer, more efficient method of heating for the entire Queen's Park complex.

We most certainly have not forgotten the direct services we deliver to the people of Ontario. We are dedicated to searching for new and improved approaches to bringing the people of this province and their government closer together.

We have seen the effect that the blue pages have had on providing the taxpayers of Ontario with the necessary information to contact their government toll free across Ontario. The blue pages were just the first step in providing total access to the provincial government by citizens in every corner of this province. We are now looking at the implementation of one-window information centres outside Metropolitan Toronto. They will be designed to offer the same personalized service that is now available to the citizens residing close to Queen's Park.

Mr. Chairman, as you might have noticed, I am proud of the accomplishments of the men and women of the Ministry of Government Services over the past year and the approaches we are taking to the 1983-84 fiscal year. I am especially proud of the fact that we have been able to do all the things I have outlined above, along with a great many more that time does not permit me to expand on, while at the same reducing our overall staff complement across the board.

I would like to close by offering my thanks for your kind attention and by saying once more how appreciative I am of having the opportunity to serve the people of Ontario for yet another year. I look forward to hearing the comments of the honourable members opposite, considering any new ideas presented and having a full discussion of the expenditures of the Ministry of Government Services for the year 1983-84.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order: I do not recall that the second paragraph on page 13 was read. I wonder if it forms part of the minister's statement, because I think the information there is rather important. If it is just

an oversight, I am sure we can just add it to the record; but I think the ideas expressed in that paragraph are certainly worthwhile.

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: Which paragraph is it?

The Deputy Chairman: It begins, "We are currently preparing a master plan." It was not read.

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: I missed page 13, did I?

The Deputy Chairman: No. You missed reading the second paragraph on page 13.

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: Oh, I thought I had done that.

12 noon

The Deputy Chairman: On page 13, you read the first paragraph, as the member for Prescott-Russell pointed out.

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: We are currently preparing a master plan which will address matters of refurbishing, repairs and improvements while at the same time maintaining the historic and architectural values ingrained in the legislative building of Ontario. I will be discussing this plan with my colleagues on both sides of this chamber in the near future and presenting the completed plan to the House at the earliest opportunity.

Mr. Haggerty: I want to thank the minister for his comments.

Perhaps I will repeat some of the things I said last year during estimates when discussing some of the problems and issues I feel he should be directing his ministry towards. I believe we discussed last year's estimates on October 22, 1982. My comments dealt primarily with government programs and the financial programs that should follow.

I was concerned about the deficit spending of the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller). I am again concerned about the deficit spending this year, which he has estimated at \$2.7 billion. I am drawing a parallel with previous Treasurers of Ontario. Back in the 1960s and 1970s they showed some prudent fiscal management. I think 1970 was the last year we had a surplus in Ontario and we have continued to spend and spend.

I would also bring to members' attention a study done by the C. D. Howe Institute, a nonprofit organization that does research into Canadian economic policy with an emphasis on fiscal policy issues. I suggested some of the recommendations to the minister so he could improve on his fiscal management and policy on

issues related to the Ministry of Government Services.

Listening to the minister's opening remarks this morning I realize there is no doubt he has followed up on some of those suggestions. I commend him for definitely cutting back on expenditures in specific areas. One area the official opposition has been pointing to for a number of years is the establishment of a central purchasing agency for the government. I believe the minister mentioned the word "window." They were establishing a purchasing agency which would buy certain things of a similar nature that could be used in other ministries. I think this is the right approach.

We have been suggesting to the minister for a number of years that he should follow some central purchasing practice. In the long run there is a saving to the taxpayer and to the government. The money saved can be spent in other areas of higher priority. I commend the minister for moving in this area.

I have tried to get my thoughts in line with some of the items in the estimates, in particular the summary of estimates and the proposals put forward. I have found difficulty with some of them because there are about three areas in which we find different figures to contend with.

In 1982-83 the estimates were \$365 million, yet in public accounts the figures were changed considerably. In the preliminary public accounts for 1982-83 I believe the actual expenditure was \$383,937,000 and the appropriations were almost \$390 million, in round figures. I suggest the variance in these figures may be confusing, particularly to members on this side, in determining what the correct figure is.

I want to draw the minister's attention to the word "appropriations." I think of the manner in which the American governments handle their government expenditures. They use the word "appropriations" rather than "estimates." When "estimates" is used the figures can be juggled around and the Treasurer can say, "We were close," or something.

It is amazing the way the Americans deal with the problem. We are dealing with the minister's estimates now. There is no doubt the money has been committed for expenditure in this year without being authorized by members of the Legislature. The expenditure has been authorized by the minister himself and the cabinet. I suggest a proper fiscal management policy, a program that would be more acceptable to the people of Ontario, would be to bring in a budget a year in advance as they do in the United

States; then the House could deal with certain matters and could advise the government where it should spend the money.

The minister may consider his approach to expenditures on certain capital projects to be the right one; however, other members in the House, even on the Conservative side, will say, "No, I do not think you should be spending it in this way." I think the main benefit of the American method of fiscal management is that members—

PEACE DEMONSTRATIONS

Mr. R. F. Johnston: On a point of privilege, Mr. Chairman: I really regret interrupting the honourable member—

Mr. Haggerty: I can see it on his face.

Mr. R. F. Johnston: I do, very seriously, and I will only take a minute or two.

At this very moment on the front lawn, down by the statue of Sir John A. Macdonald, a group of peace activists is trying to establish a peace camp as has been done in Ottawa. Under direction from the Ministry of Government Services the security guards are ordering that the pup tent which has been established be torn down. They say they will allow it to stay up if the minister so indicates. Therefore, I am going to ask him to do so; and if not to explain why not. It seems to me there is a basic infringement of their rights. I do not understand why the pup tent cannot be put up. I would like an explanation from the minister.

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: If the member for Erie (Mr. Haggerty) would go on, I will find out from my staff a little bit more of the background on this and report.

Mr. R. F. Johnston: I understand they are being treated as trespassers at the moment, and I think that is pretty offensive.

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: If the member would go on with his remarks, I will find that out.

[Later]

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: Mr. Chairman, before we hear the opening remarks of the NDP member, I would like to answer the point of privilege raised by the member for Scarborough West.

Some time ago, as the member knows, we had a similar case, where a group wanted to put a Johnny-on-the-spot out on the lawn, and we said at that time it was our policy not to do that.

In this case I wanted to make quite clear, before I responded at all, that this group had a permit. They have not, I am told, obtained a permit from the city of Toronto. That is upsetting

the Metropolitan Toronto police, and the member opposite who asked the question knows full well that we have not allowed tents and things of that sort to be on the front lawn since I have been the minister. I do not think anyone was ever allowed to do that.

Our staff are very co-operative, as they have been with all demonstrations around this building. We will set up microphones to be helpful to them. In this case I understand nothing was done about the permit from the city of Toronto and nothing was done to contact our staff about setting up microphones. So they will have to remove the tent. We will be pleased to set up the microphones if they wish us to do so, but I wish they would follow the rules, which I think everyone has become very familiar with. They know our ministry will assist them if they go about it in the proper way.

I hope that answers the member's—

Mr. R. F. Johnston: It does not exactly. If I might—

Mr. Chairman: We cannot go into that. You have had your point of privilege.

Mr. R. F. Johnston: No, I want to continue my point of privilege. You can throw me out of here if you want and continue this kind of attitude. The minister's officers would not even let me come up here and get his answer before they were going to call the Metro cops and evict those people.

Mr. Chairman: Order. The member will have his opportunity to question the minister as soon as he finishes responding to the member for Erie.

Interjection.

Mr. Chairman: Please do not turn on his microphone. I am not recognizing the member. Would the minister care to respond? Not to the point of privilege; the member has had his opportunity.

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: I think I have answered the member. I told him the tent has to be removed. In future I suggest if he knows of a demonstration like this, he should advise the group of the proper steps to take. There are proper steps. If they would like our staff to set up a microphone, and there are no other demonstrations planned ahead of them—

Mr. R. F. Johnston: They don't want a microphone.

Hon. Mr. Wiseman:—because the odd time we get a group that has not set up a demonstration in advance and wants to bump out a group

that has; we take the one that has gone through the proper procedure. In this case, if the member wants an answer from me, the answer is they have to remove the tent. If they want to demonstrate, that is their business, providing they follow all the rules.

Mr. Chairman: Would the minister continue with his response to the remarks of the member for Erie.

Mr. Philip: I thought the minister's normal procedure was that both opposition critics would speak.

Mr. Chairman: Would you proceed then?

Mr. Philip: Mr. Chairman, by way of continuing on the point of privilege under my opening remarks, I would like to suggest to the minister he may have misunderstood the point my colleague the member for Scarborough West was trying to make. He had advised this group of the proper procedures, as any of us do when we are advised of a demonstration. We are all concerned that demonstrations, particularly peace demonstrations, are peaceful and follow normal procedures that are set out. However, what I believe my colleague was trying to say to the minister was he had asked that nothing be done until he had an opportunity, a period of 10 minutes, to discuss this with the minister, but even during that period of time the forces, if one wants, were being active.

I can understand his anger. A 10-minute delay until he could discuss it with the minister was not an unreasonable request. I hope the minister will look into this further and report back to us.

ESTIMATES, MINISTRY OF GOVERNMENT SERVICES (continued)

Mr. Haggerty: I was dealing with the appropriations procedures established in the United States Congress. I suggest their approach to government expenditure is something this government should consider. Even changes recommended by procedural affairs and so on should be considered by the government. I think we should deal with current estimates, not those already adopted or planned this year without having been authorized by the Legislature itself.

We do everything about a year behind. We should be dealing with things for the year ahead. Then the government, in bringing about its expenditures, could set the stage for the direction the economy will flow in. It would be of

benefit not only to the people in the chamber but people outside—the private sector would know the direction in which the government is programming its expenditures.

In the long term there would be a spinoff to the private sector and everyone would share in it. Not only that but the jobs can be better predicted than they are here. In the minister's speech he said jobs are the most important thing facing this government. I think it is even more important to everyone outside this chamber who is unemployed. There has to be a clear-cut direction for the government to move in; more than the new employment expansion and development program where persons will be employed for a maximum of three months or six months and then will go on to unemployment insurance. Then we seem to forget about them.

12:10 p.m.

I suggested to the minister that he move those capital projects up a year or two years so we could create additional jobs for at least two or three years of steady employment, particularly in construction, since the government is building new buildings throughout Ontario. We should be looking at the American side in budgeting the programs and the different ministries in the province. I think it is worthwhile to take a good close look. It would give the opposition members, and even the back-benchers on the other side, an opportunity to have some say in where capital projects should be constructed in Ontario.

I am not quite convinced when I look at the minister's estimates that he has spent all the money estimated last year for capital projects. It was a good figure, over \$70 million. I do not know if he has spent that. There is nothing in his budget or estimate papers or in his comments this morning that indicates whether he has spent that money.

This year, estimated capital projects will be about \$34 million—almost a \$37-million change from last year. I draw that to the minister's attention. There are so many vacancies in his approach to numbers that opposition members, or even government members, cannot tell whether he has spent the money. There are so many different ways one can look at those figures. They vary so much it raises some concern for me to find out if he has spent the money.

I believe I mentioned the public accounts where the appropriations—I use the word "appropriations"—were almost \$390 million, some \$15 million more than what the estimates were. There is nothing in there to tell me where that expenditure really occurred. If we are

going to be dealing with taxpayers' money, I suggest that full disclosure should be one of the major concerns of the ministry. We should have disclosure of certain areas where the money is going to be spent.

The Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Snow) has an excellent program. One can go almost five years ahead and know pretty well where the road expenditures and capital projects are going to be developed or constructed or will commence to be constructed. This is good and I think this is one of the policies this government has sent out, for example, to local municipalities on their five-year forecasting for capital projects. This ministry could develop such a program, so that we would have more knowledge and better views of the minister's department. That is one of the areas I am concerned about. It is an area that requires some improvement.

In connection with the NEED program: The minister has indicated he wants additional jobs created in Ontario. We should be taking a look at his long-range program on capital projects. Can we perhaps advance them so we could create jobs in the construction industry that would provide additional jobs for a period of one, two or three years, and allow the private sector to catch up? By that time, we may have a better job opportunity climate in Ontario. We are looking at some 551,000 people being employed in the province.

With those few comments I will give the minister time to deal with some of the questions I have raised, and we will wait for the New Democratic Party critic to bring forth his ideas. Then we will get into the bread and butter issues of the minister's estimates.

12:20 p.m.

Mr. Philip: I appreciate an opportunity to participate in these debates. I am not going to make a long opening statement because I would rather deal with items one at a time under the appropriate vote.

There are four ministries for which I act as the critic, and in dealing with this ministry I always feel a little frustrated. I feel a little like a priest who is hearing the confession of a surrogate sinner, if one can imagine such a thing. This ministry is often in a position where it has little control over certain policy matters. It is really carrying out the sins of other ministers, so to speak; therefore, it is hard to find blame in many cases or even to offer constructive alternatives when many of the problems this minister faces are really not of his own making.

I was pleased to read the statement of the minister of April 22 concerning the pilot project to determine economies and improvement in telecommunication systems. However, I would appreciate it if we could go into more details on this study; more specifically, when it will be completed and exactly how much is expected to be saved.

In the statement he made in the House the minister alluded to the fact that private sector corporations have shown savings of up to 25 per cent in telecommunications costs; however, there has been no indication of exactly how much he is projecting will be saved by this study.

Since the ministry has announced that certain people, at least members of the Legislature and certain levels of government, will now be switching to the much faster and more convenient push button phone system, I think it would be interesting to find out if there have been any studies in terms of productivity to find out exactly what the savings can be by switching to that kind of telephone system over the old, obsolete and slow dial system.

I imagine productivity could be increased substantially in certain offices; I look at the savings I have experienced in my riding office that has the push button phone and which I hope will now be realized in my parliamentary office.

I must say I find the opening statement of the minister alarming. I find it alarming inasmuch as it is so general one really wonders at times what he is talking about.

I am particularly concerned about these broad, general statements about privatization of government. We have had this happening in the health care field where the Minister of Health (Mr. Grossman) has not been prepared to table contracts, such as the one with Extendicare over Queensway General Hospital. He has not tabled any cost-benefit analysis.

From some of the information we have been able to get out of places like Hawkesbury where this privatization is taking place, we do know it is taking place by a reduction of staff and, one would suspect, probably by a reduction of service. I find that alarming in the health care area, but I also find it alarming in other areas of government services.

Nor do we have any kind of assurances this privatization will not take place by the process of using nonunion labour. I would certainly like the minister to address himself to that question. If any savings are accrued by this privatization, is it really on the backs of the public employees,

who through their union movement have fought for decent wages? Will it be on the backs of nonunionized, underpaid workers that this government plans to make this kind of saving?

In contrast to the route the government is taking let me suggest, in particular when the minister is talking about the need for co-ordinating services, that one area I would like to see the government look at, and I would be interested to know whether or not the minister has had any studies on it, is the co-ordination of travel.

When one considers the great number of flights taken by government officials, by officials of the various ministries, the ministers themselves and members of the Legislature, one can imagine that there could be considerable savings by having an office to co-ordinate travel. Other governments have done this. It would be interesting to find out exactly what savings have been made by those governments which have a co-ordinated government office for this purpose. We would also like to look at whether or not it might make sense for such an office to take over from the Ministry of Natural Resources in negotiating contracts for charter flights and for the private craft that are being used by ministers and occasionally, I suppose, by some of the senior officials of the government.

While I am on the topic of travel, I find interesting, and I would like this minister's view on it, the whole area of limousines. My colleague the member for Port Arthur (Mr. Foulds) has placed on the order paper on at least two occasions fairly detailed questions on the use of limousines by cabinet ministers. It is interesting to note this government has failed to reply to those questions.

What is this government afraid of? Why are they afraid to tell us exactly what limousines are being used, why and by whom? Are they senior officials? Are they deputy ministers, political advisers? Who exactly are using these limousines; when; and what is the total cost? We really do not have a breakdown on such things as staff costs for the manning of these limousines, food costs while on the road, which ministries are making the most use of them and in what way and so forth.

Similarly, I would like to deal with the whole area that is spelled out in the minister's statement about the use of private rental space by the various ministries. I am particularly astounded by the Ministry of Energy's communications branch on the ground floor of Queen's Park Place. That is a very expensive building. I can understand that perhaps the Minister of Energy

(Mr. Welch) wants to go first class, but I would ask what criteria are used by the Ministry of Government Services in deciding what office space is rented and where. One wonders why they need that kind of luxury space in that kind of building. What kind of buck are the taxpayers paying for that?

If I am not mistaken, the Ministry of Energy's communications branch has been accommodated in rented and leased space on the ground floor of Queen's Park Place at 62 Wellesley Street West. This is during a time of restraint. Would it not be more appropriate for this office to be located in a standard, government office building?

I would also like the details on the cost of accommodation compared to government owned and operated space. This whole thrust towards privatization has to be measured in terms of cost, and I suspect the thrusts this ministry and other ministries are taking, in the long run if not in the short run, are actually costing the taxpayers more money than going some of the more traditional routes.

12:30 p.m.

The ground floor space in the building I am talking about was clearly designed to accommodate a service commercial establishment—that is, a convenience store. It was not designed as a communications or propaganda office, if you want. As an indication of how luxurious this accommodation is, when the suites in this building were first offered for sale in 1981 they were placed on the market at from \$180,000 to \$286,000.

I would also ask the minister to bring us up to date on what is happening to the east-of-Bay land. Is the Ministry of Government Services, in conjunction with the city of Toronto, actively working on that development plan for this property, other than the new Young Men's Christian Association, which is currently under construction? What is the latest update on east of Bay, and how does this minister's plan for the use of space fit into this?

I also want to have an update on the memo from the ministry of December 23, I believe it is, on parking. It says: "It should be realized that any long-term solution to parking problems can only be obtained when considered in conjunction with the many other associated problems with regard to this building: the ongoing changing occupancy in use, ongoing proposals, renovations, aesthetics," and so forth.

One assumes that the ongoing problems are the ongoing problems of the use of various types

of real estate, in this area anyway, for government purposes. I would like to know where the government is going in this regard, where the various projects and rental space in private-enterprise buildings in the area fit into this and where we are going to have, if you want, the bodies that are using the various parking spaces the minister is concerned about.

A number of proposals or recommendations were adopted in that memo: authorize ticketing of unauthorized vehicles; obtain special status permitting government staff to issue tickets; relocate the kiosks, especially at the southeast entrance; issue compulsory identification to authorized parkers; improved directional safety; restrict parking signage; relocate authorized parking; instruct MGS staff regarding enforcement, and communicate progress to user group.

I hope the minister can provide a detailed update on each of those points and that we can deal with them accordingly. What is happening in each of the recommendations? I recognize that the minister was kind enough to write me a letter on March 11, 1983. That is my birthday, so it is a birthday gift to me. It gives me some information, but I hope he will give us more details on that.

I found it interesting in the minister's broad, general statement about improving access to public buildings that he throws around a figure of \$2 million that has been spent, yet he does not say where it was spent, when it was spent and the time frame. One has to ask what the \$2 million really means. It is a meaningless figure unless you talk specifically about what was spent, where and how and what they intend to spend in the future.

I am sorry, I guess the \$2-million figure came from the minister's statement of April 12, rather than the statement he gave in the House. It was a statement dated April 12, 1983, with a heading, "Improving Access to Public Buildings for Handicapped Persons." By the way, the reference to \$2 million was in the third paragraph.

I also found the next two paragraphs interesting. They state: "To help co-ordinate these efforts and to provide a one-window service to client ministries and the disabled, the ministry has set up a barrier-free-design office."

"This office is in the design services branch and will provide technical advice on adapting existing buildings and designs of the new buildings. It will also keep an up-to-date record of new developments in this field."

I would find it interesting if the minister would tell us whether or not there is now an

inventory of buildings in terms of what needs to be done to provide accessibility for handicapped persons and what the role of this new office will be to see that those that are designated as being insufficient will have work done on them to bring them up to required standards of accessibility. Furthermore, what is the time frame? What are we talking about in terms of costs for each of those? What is the time frame on the various projects that need to be done?

It may well be this office is still in the process of setting up that information, but it would be useful to have that kind of statement from the ministry.

I found a few other statements by the minister rather interesting. He talks about the shredding of government documents and the fact he has been able to save some money by the recycling—

Mr. Boudria: How about the shredding of budgets?

Mr. Philip: The shredding of budgets; I do not think that falls under this particular minister's worry. There are other documents he is concerned about which, of course, would have to be shredded.

We had a fascinating exercise with the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Snow) over confidentiality of records a number of years ago. Finally, he put into the act the minister's responsibility if private, confidential, medical information were accidentally leaked to insurance companies or others who might profit by it. The ministry could be held responsible for it.

I am wondering what the security system is that the minister talks about. What is the responsibility if there is a leak? What are the kinds of documents he sees as having a high security priority? What are the ones he has to take particular security with?

When we develop a security system, as the minister will well recognize, we do not have a whole bunch of people going around protecting everything. If we do, it is very costly and invariably whatever really is high-priority security gets through. What is his target in terms of security? What are the kinds of things he is trying to protect? It seems as though he is saying everything is going to be shredded. Maybe I have misinterpreted the statements by the minister because they were very general, but what is he targeting in terms of the shredding? What happens if some of those documents are leaked? Who is responsible for that and what are the repercussions?

I found the minister's statement on buy

Canadian very general. First of all, he does not really say that in buying Canadian we are buying from Canadian-owned-and-operated businesses. I assume he means his buy Canadian policy would include Canadian-based companies owned by multinational, American or other foreign interests. I am wondering if there is any distinction he makes in the buy Canadian policy in this regard.

12:40 p.m.

I also find it interesting that the US federal government has a policy whereby one third of its expenditures on procurement is directed to small businesses. I am wondering whether the minister has looked into—

Mr. Boudria: Like John Eakins's bill.

Mr. Philip: Yes. I have not had an opportunity to study the bill of the member for Victoria-Haliburton (Mr. Eakins) in great detail, but I have looked at what the US federal government has done.

One of the interesting things we find is that the small corporations in Canada, by and large, are owned by Canadians, whereas as we get into the larger corporations there is a larger preponderance of foreign ownership. One would think that in keeping with the minister's buy Canadian policy—which one assumes is part of a general philosophical feeling he and I both share of being masters in our house, to repeat an old cliché—he would have a policy of encouraging small business, which would be encouraging businesses that are more likely to be owned by Canadians or by people living in Ontario. Therefore, in a sense, in that way we would be sharing the profits of our taxes with our own people.

There has been renewed interest in Minaki Lodge. I am not going to deal with that now, but—

Mr. Boudria: Forty-five million dollars.

Mr. Philip: Yes, \$45 million, as I said on Metro Morning yesterday and as the member for Renfrew North (Mr. Conway) and I were discussing there yesterday.

The Minaki of jails has to be Burwash. The only difference is that at least Minaki now has a few rich businessmen who are using Minaki, whereas Burwash has the beautiful basketball courts but nobody is using them. Also, Bison is the analogy.

I am sure the minister is embarrassed that this great white elephant—another white elephant of the north in this case—happens to have been built and is sitting there vacant. I am sure that somewhere down the line the Minister of Tourism and Recreation (Mr. Baetz) will come along

and say: "Burwash is a great site for Minaki II. We have a luxurious gymnasium there. We will have to expand it. We will spend another \$45 million on it. We will have another group of rich businessmen using the jail rather than the people for whom it was intended."

One really has to wonder. The rationale in closing Burwash, as I recall—I was not the critic at that time—was that it was inhumane for people to come a great distance to see their relatives in this site. Now we have seen the closing of the jails in Sudbury—and I am sorry the Minister of Correctional Services (Mr. Leluk) has left, because I did not get to ask my supplementary in response to his answer to the question I asked him in the House today.

We are trying to be "humane." So we close Burwash because people have to go too far to visit their relatives. Then we have Sudbury. But we close Sudbury, 20 miles away from Burwash, and ship those prisoners 600 miles to Thunder Bay. If we are going to be humane to people, why is it any more humane for northerners whose relatives would have been in a jail in Sudbury to go to Thunder Bay than for me, if my sister or brother, heaven forbid, should end up in jail, to visit him or her in Sudbury?

We seem to have two standards. We do not want these poor southerners to go all the way to Sudbury to visit their relatives, but it is okay for the poor suckers in Sudbury to go all the way to Thunder Bay to visit their relatives.

Now, if I were a northerner—and I am, because I represent northern Etobicoke, so I have a certain empathy for the north—I would say there seems to be discrimination against the penal population in northern Ontario. The government has empathy for the poor people in southern Ontario travelling long distances, but the poor people in northern Ontario are rugged and are supposed to be used to this kind of thing; they can go over to Thunder Bay to visit their relatives.

What is the real purpose of this? What is the minister going to do with the thing? Is he going to build another jail in Sudbury? Why can he not open up Burwash so the people in Sudbury will not have to travel that great distance?

The Minister of Correctional Services talked today about all the great things he is doing to open up more space. He is not opening up more space; he is simply crowding more people in. If you look at the renovations that are being done, they are taking away recreation space, storage space and other kinds of space and simply cramming more bunks and cell space into it. Yet

here we have Burwash sitting empty—rotting, if you want—while people and officials and so forth are travelling back and forth from Sudbury to Thunder Bay or, at the very least, to North Bay.

Those are a few of the comments I would like to make. I have some other comments in greater detail about media studios and a few other things.

In closing, I would like to invite the minister to see how a party that knows how to run things in a businesslike fashion can run something. I invite the minister to be my guest—I will even buy the button for him—at the New Democratic Party spring fair, where he will see a great amount of enterprise, where he will be more than welcome along with the 8,000 or 10,000 other people who will show up on Sunday, where he will be treated royally to bands and other entertainment and, indeed, where the member for York South (Mr. Rae), our leader, will no doubt have a special song for him.

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: Mr. Chairman, after that last commercial I do not want to lump all NDP people together but, being a small businessman from Lanark, I have never found they are very good at doing day-to-day business with the small business people whom the member for Etobicoke says we should be looking after. Many of them have never had to meet a payroll, as I have myself. But I could be wrong; you might find one or two in the caucus who had done that.

Mr. Philip: Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege: I recall the day in this House when that kind of silly statement was made by another minister. At that time I asked all the people in the House who had business experience to stand up, and there were more who stood up from the NDP than from the other two parties.

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: Probably if the honourable member tried that today, it might not work out that way for him. However, I do not want to be provocative before a long weekend.

I would like to try to answer some of the questions. The member for Erie (Mr. Haggerty) asked about the difference in our capital allocation going from approximately \$90 million in 1982-83 down to \$44.2 million this year. That is quite simple to answer, I believe: It was because of two big capital projects, the Oshawa Revenue building and the Ontario health insurance plan building in Kingston.

Mr. Chairman: Fine building.

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: The Chairman says it is a fine building.

Mr. Chairman: What are we going to do with Pine Ridge school?

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: He will be able to ask me questions on that later.

I do agree with the member for Erie that it would be nice if we could have a five-year plan. We are working towards that. Just to share this with the honourable members, we do have a different system than we had a few years ago in that we take all the projects each ministry has on its wish list, if one wants to call it that, to the policy fields and the policy fields help us decide from the allocation they have which ones are given the high priority.

12:50 p.m.

I think the members know we have to be a bit flexible on that, because what is high priority today may not be high priority five years down the road, for many of the reasons the member for Etobicoke (Mr. Philip) mentioned.

We may need a new correctional institution or something of that sort that we could not foresee, or perhaps that we found was of higher priority than some of the other buildings we had on there. We have to be a bit flexible but we are working and trying. It would be a lot simpler for my staff if they had a five-year plan.

I will go over some matters briefly and the members may want to come back at our next sitting to get into more detail on them. As far as the push-button phones for the members' offices are concerned, we gave all the information to the Board of Internal Economy and I know, from using one myself, it will speed up the operations of our gals in the office and of ourselves.

To give a dollar saving on that is pretty hard, as I think the member knew when he asked the question, but listening to the standing committee on members' services, I think everybody there felt it would be a great help, not only to them but to their office assistants.

I was a little disappointed the member for Etobicoke thought our statement did not spell out a little more about what we were going to do. I listened to his seven or eight questions after that. If he had listened to and read the statement, he would have seen we covered those in it.

Maybe the statement did not mean as much to him as it did to me but, being a businessman, any time I can show savings such as we have in there in different areas—I did not have time to show all the savings we have made—and at the same

time keep our staff at a lower level, then I think that is running a business in a very efficient way.

To answer the statement that we were so general in a statement like this, if the member wanted me to take a couple of hours, I guess I could have done that, but I would sooner have the dialogue back and forth so the member asks the questions he knows are bothering him, to which I hope we can give the answers.

As far as wages go, in all our contracts we use the fair-wage guidelines. We have not had much trouble with that over the period I have been with Government Services, so we will continue to use that government policy. We use fair-wage guidelines in determining the wages we pay for jobs.

The member knows the Ministry of Natural Resources looks after planes. I will only say, as one minister, that if we are going to a particular area we do try to double up. In some cases the Premier (Mr. Davis) feels only a certain number can go on a plane for safety reasons. I guess he does not want us all wiped out in one shot if it happened to go down. I could be wrong, but I believe the number travelling on any one plane at any one time is something like three ministers of the crown.

Many members make reference to limousines. The car I drive at home is better than the car that drives me around when I am here. I really do not believe the people of Lanark think I drive a limousine. I drive a Buick. I drive an Oldsmobile here but the one I have at home has many more features than the one I have here. I am sure the people of Lanark do not believe it is a limousine. I could not afford one anyway.

As far as giving the cost of all these is concerned, I have seen that on the order paper different times. We can give the cost for our ministry, but I do not have all the other ministries at my fingertips.

We are pursuing the east-of-Bay project with the mayor of Toronto; in fact, yesterday afternoon we had another meeting on that. We are sticking to our guns for the million square feet of office space for the future across the other side. Members have heard me say many times that is what we want. We are getting more co-operation now, and it looks as if we will have something settled in the near future on that site. I will be able to report back to the Legislature when that happens, but at this time I do not want to say too much more because we are still in negotiations.

Mr. Haggerty: I thought you had the footings in already.

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: No. We will have them in pretty fast if we get that million square feet; some of them anyway.

As to the \$2 million for our handicapped, referring to the statement the honourable member mentioned I made in the House, we have done a lot of work, and I think the member knows that, around this building and others. He wondered what the officer is doing right now. I spoke to him yesterday and we are working on another area. For those who have a hearing problem, we will have phones located in this building as well. The phone will be marked, and no one will know the person has a problem, other than by the sign above it saying it is a phone that can be adjusted to a person's hearing needs. We will have them in this building and other buildings throughout these complexes.

As the member knows, just around this building we built the ramp at the front. I know that was in years gone by, but if he looks around he can see the washrooms here were done in last year's budget to give access to the handicapped. One just needs to look around this building. It is very difficult to have a lot of services here for the handicapped because of the age of the building and the elevation at the front and so on, but we have done it. We have done it on all our retrofit buildings, and of course it is a must in all our new buildings, such as the new courthouse that opened in St. Catharines yesterday.

The shredding of documents is another saving we are making. We do not have to keep them in storage. We used to have to pay in advance \$140,000 a year. Now we are shredding them, and we are putting them back into recycled paper. I do not have to tell anyone that I hope something up to 1,000 tons of recycled paper will go in to make up this \$140,000 this year. The \$12,000 we are paid is another add-on, so we are really saving \$152,000 in that program and may be helping not to destroy so many trees.

I think everyone in this House knows I am fully committed to the buy Canadian policy. I know the member for Prescott-Russell (Mr. Boudria) knows that. If members read the statement I made, it showed that 100 per cent of the 1,100 items in the sundries end are purchased in Canada and 95 per cent of those are manufactured in Canada. Only about five per cent, I am told, are bought offshore and assembled here. They are all assembled or sold through Canadian manufacturers or suppliers.

We have set up a procurement officer—we give him another title in the statement—to work along this line, to show where we can buy more

Canadian products. We have gone to trade fairs. There was one held here recently at the Skyline and we had our people there talking on how to sell to government. We found people who manufacture certain items we did not know they could manufacture were in fact manufacturing in Canada. So it was helpful to us and to them to have this dialogue with us.

We will continue to work along with the Ministry of Industry and Trade. As I said in my statement, we know that if we buy Canadian it means more jobs for our fellow Canadians, those who are out of work, and we have a responsibility in that area.

Regarding Burwash, if the honourable member knows anyone we could sell that to we would be pleased to hear from him. We have tried, since I have been in the Ministry of Government Services, to assist the people in the area—through Sudbury 2001, I believe it was—and the member for Sudbury (Mr. Martel) was supporting them. We helped when they had the

goat farm and we have allowed farmers to farm the farm land. On the part across the road east of the entrance, we have given a lease to the native people to develop it. I understand that development is taking place.

Regarding Burwash, we are actively trying to get someone in there. We have had some of our sister ministries up to have a look at it. I hope we will be successful. I know the member for Etobicoke would like to see something for the benefit of all Ontario, but he would not oppose something that would be of benefit to the member for the area, the member for Sudbury (Mr. Gordon), and members from his own side of the House.

We are actively working on that, and we look forward to our next session.

On motion by Hon. Mr. Wiseman, the committee of supply reported progress.

The House adjourned at 1:03 p.m.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS IN ORDERS AND NOTICES

PSYCHIATRIC PATIENTS

1. Mr. McClellan: Will the Minister of Health provide the following data on patients in the psychiatric units of the general hospitals:

1. What are the methods of admission for each of the psychiatric units of the general hospitals in 1980 and 1981?

2. What are the numbers of patients currently in psychiatric units of the general hospitals?

3. What are the numbers of admissions for each hospital by age, sex and diagnosis for the year 1981-82?

4. What are the numbers of discharges for each hospital by age, sex and diagnosis for the year 1981-82?

5. What is the number and classification of staff for each of the psychiatric units of the general hospitals in 1981-82? [Tabled April 19, 1983]

See sessional paper 50.

2. Mr. McClellan: Will the Minister of Health provide the following data on patients in the 10 provincial psychiatric hospitals:

1. What are the methods of admission for each of the provincial psychiatric hospitals in 1980 and 1981?

2. What are the numbers of patients currently in provincial psychiatric hospitals by age and diagnosis?

3. What are the numbers of admissions for each hospital by age, sex and diagnosis for the year 1981-82?

4. What are the numbers of discharges for each hospital by age, sex and diagnosis for the year 1981-82?

5. What is the number and classification of staff for each of the 10 hospitals in 1981-82? [Tabled April 19, 1983]

See sessional paper 51.

QUEEN STREET MENTAL
HEALTH CENTRE

3. Mr. McClellan: Will the Minister of Health advise the House how many involuntary patients at the Queen Street Mental Health Centre have wandered out of the centre without official leave during January, February and March, 1983? [Tabled April 19, 1983]

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The number of AWOL patients involuntary in 1983: January, 12; February, 16; March, 12; quarterly total, 40.

NUMBER OF HOSPITAL BEDS

4. Mr. McClellan: Will the Minister of Health table the number of hospital beds as of March 31, 1983, broken down into: (1) active treatment beds; (2) chronic care beds; (3) extended care nursing home beds; and (4) extended care homes for the aged beds? [Tabled April 19, 1983]

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The number of beds as of March 31, 1983, is as follows:

Acute treatment beds (including psychiatric), 36,636; chronic care beds (including rehabilitation), 12,955;

Extended care—nursing home, 28,941; homes for the aged, 12,881.

MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

5. Mr. McClellan: Will the Minister of Health advise the House what detailed statistical information concerning mental health services in Ontario is routinely provided to Statistics Canada? [Tabled April 19, 1983]

See sessional paper 52.

INFORMATION ON MUNICIPALITIES

6. Mr. Eakins: Would the Minister of Industry and Trade supply the following information:

1. What was the cost to the ministry for production of the 1980 Profiles of Ontario/Canada Municipalities?

2. What was the cost to the ministry of the 1981 Profiles of Ontario/Canada Municipalities?

3. For each municipality in Ontario, would the minister provide the following information for the year 1982: (a) the number of plants established, (b) the number of jobs added; (c) the number of plants closed; (d) the number of jobs lost; and (e) the number of plant expansions?

4. For each municipality in Ontario, would the minister also provide the following information for 1982: (a) the amount and percentage of commercial/industrial taxes; (b) the amount and percentage of business taxes; (c) the average residential and farm property tax per household?

5. Since the ministry does not intend to publish a 1982 Profiles of Ontario Municipalities, when does the ministry intend to publish the 1983 Profiles of Ontario/Canada Municipalities? [Tabled April 20, 1983]

See sessional paper 53.

WORKERS' COMPENSATION BOARD

7. Mr. Di Santo: Will the Minister of Labour table the following information:

1. How many specialists are employed by the employment services branch of the vocational rehabilitation division of the Workers' Compensation Board?

2. How many injured workers have been placed by the specialists in each year since the inception of this service?

3. How many workers placed through this service have or are receiving wage supplements by the Workers' Compensation Board?

4. How long does the job placement normally continue after the workers' wage supplements cease? [Tabled April 20, 1983]

Hon. Mr. Ramsay: 1. Thirteen.

2. Two hundred and ninety-six workers were placed from March 2, 1982, the inception of the service, to March 31, 1983.

3. The board does not keep any statistics on this.

4. This information is not readily available, as it would be necessary to review thousands of files. However, after completion of the program and before a worker's case is closed, the counsellor follows up for an additional four to six weeks to ensure that there is no further problem. If a worker is later dismissed or laid off, and still cannot return to his or her previous trade or occupation, the case can be reopened at any time.

TRUST COMPANIES

10. Mr. Peterson: Would the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations indicate the number of persons whose employment with Seaway Trust has been terminated during the period January 7 to March 31, 1983? [Tabled April 20, 1983]

Hon. Mr. Elgie: During the period from January 7 to March 31, 1983, no employees were terminated at Seaway Trust Co.

11. Mr. Peterson: Would the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations indicate the number of persons whose employment with Greymac Trust has been terminated during the period January 7 to March 31, 1983? [Tabled April 20, 1983]

Hon. Mr. Elgie: During the period from January 7 to March 31, 1983, the employment of 16 persons, including eight persons in part-time positions, was terminated at Greymac Trust.

12. Mr. Peterson: Would the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations indicate

the number of persons whose employment with Crown Trust has been terminated during the period January 7 to February 7, 1983? [Tabled April 20, 1983]

Hon. Mr. Elgie: During the period from January 7 to March 31, 1983, the employment of one person was terminated at Crown Trust.

13. Mr. Peterson: Would the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations indicate the number of persons whose employment with Kilderkin Investments has been terminated during the period January 7 to March 31, 1983? [Tabled April 20, 1983]

Hon. Mr. Elgie: I have been advised by the interim receiver and manager, the Clarkson Co. Ltd., that since they took control of Kilderkin Investments Ltd. on February 15, the employment of 24 employees has been terminated and that these include the 23 who were advised on April 26 by the Clarkson Co. that their services were no longer needed.

14. Mr. Peterson: Would the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations indicate the number of persons whose employment with Maysfield Property Management has been terminated during the period January 7 to March 31, 1983? [Tabled April 20, 1983]

Hon. Mr. Elgie: I have been advised by the interim receiver and manager, the Clarkson Co. Ltd., that since they took control of Maysfield Property Management Inc. on February 3, there may have been one or two persons who left or were terminated and that 305 employees continue to be gainfully employed working on the former Cadillac Fairview buildings.

18. Mr. Peterson: Would the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations indicate the cost to the ministry of the Morrison inquiry, pursuant to section 152 of the Loan and Trust Corporations Act? [Tabled April 20, 1983]

Hon. Mr. Elgie: As at March 31, 1983, \$717,977 has been paid to cover the cost of the Morrison special investigation and inquiry pursuant to section 152 of the Loan and Trust Corporations Act.

19. Mr. Peterson: Would the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations advise of the terms and conditions set out in the offers of those other trust companies submitting offers for the management/acquisition of Crown Trust Co.? [Tabled April 20, 1983]

Hon. Mr. Elgie: The Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations is unable to provide the terms and conditions set out in the offers of

other trust companies submitting offers for the management/acquisition of Crown Trust Co. because such offers were made on the basis that if not accepted, they would remain confidential.

20. Mr. Peterson: Would the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations set out the terms of reference by which the internal independence review of ministry staff and procedures, as announced, is to be guided? [Tabled April 20, 1983]

Hon. Mr. Elgie: The terms of reference by which the internal independent review of the ministry staff and procedures is being guided are "to review the adequacy of the administrative practices and procedures of the financial institutions division as to their adequacy to carry out the requirements of the loan and trust legislation."

21. Mr. Peterson: Would the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations set out the terms of reference by which the Residential Tenancy Commission SWAT team, as announced, is to be guided? [Tabled April 20, 1983]

Hon. Mr. Elgie: The group of residential tenancy commissioners and support staff referred to as a SWAT team was conceived by the commission in the fall of 1982, to deal primarily with a group of applications for rent review for the group of residential complexes formerly owned by Cadillac Fairview Corp., which were the subject of two resales in quick succession, involving Greymac Credit Corp. and Kilderkinn Investments Ltd.

Their terms of reference are, and they are guided in their considerations by exactly the same considerations that guide other residential tenancy commissioners and staff when dealing with other applications:

They are to investigate, hold hearings and hear evidence and argument, make findings and establish rents by orders, in accordance with the requirements of the Residential Tenancies Act and the Statutory Powers Procedure Act.

These commissioners and staff will be dealing with these particular applications as a group, since all of these complexes formed a part of the same transaction or group of transactions, with what appear to be the same basic facts, which will apply to each of the applications with respect to these complexes. By using the same group of commissioners and staff, the commission will be able to deal with these applications in a consistent way.

22. Mr. Peterson: Would the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations set out the terms of reference by which the five-person team "recruited to assist the registrar" as announced, is to be guided? [Tabled April 20, 1983]

Hon. Mr. Elgie: The advisory committee was established to provide guidance to the registrar from experienced businessmen on issues arising from the registrar's possession and control of Crown Trust Co., Greymac Trust Co. and Seaway Trust Co. and in particular the issues which must be considered in order to preserve or realize on the assets of these companies for the benefit of depositors, other creditors and shareholders in that order of priority.

23. Mr. Peterson: Would the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations advise the amount of funds advanced to Crown Trust Co. by Canada Deposit Insurance Corp. between January 7 and February 7, 1983? [Tabled April 20, 1983]

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Between January 7 and February 7, 1983, Canada Deposit Insurance Corp. did not advance any funds to Crown Trust Co.

24. Mr. Peterson: Would the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations advise the amount of funds advanced to Seaway Trust by the Canada Deposit Insurance Corp. between January 7 and March 31, 1983? [Tabled April 30, 1983]

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Between January 7 and March 31, 1983, Canada Deposit Insurance Corp. advanced funds to Seaway Trust Co. in the amount of \$1,700,000.

25. Mr. Peterson: Would the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations advise the amount of funds advanced to Greymac Trust by Canada Deposit Insurance Corp. between January 7 and February 7, 1983? [Tabled April 20, 1983]

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Between January 7 and March 31, 1983, Canada Deposit Insurance Corp. advanced funds to Greymac Trust Co. in the amount of \$30,600,000.

26. Mr. Peterson: Would the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations advise which person, persons, entity or entities, in his opinion, have the capacity to sell the Cadillac Fairview buildings, subject of the recent trust company controversy? [Tabled April 20, 1983]

Hon. Mr. Elgie: From the investigations that have been conducted, it would appear that the

original 50 numbered companies are the owners of the Cadillac Fairview properties. The numbered companies have had their names changed as shown on the attached list. These companies have been constrained by an order made on February 3, 1983, by the Associate Chief Justice of the High Court in the Supreme Court of Ontario from in any way dealing with, disposing of or encumbering any interest any of them may hold in these properties pending the completion of litigation to trace and recover the moneys advanced by the three trust companies on the security of these properties.

In the Supreme Court of Ontario
No. 1380/83

The Honourable the Associate Chief Justice of the High Court; Thursday, the 3rd day of February, 1983.

Between: Crown Trust Co., Seaway Trust Co. and Greymac Trust Company, plaintiffs; and

Leonard Rosenberg, William Player, Andrew Markle, Pierre Desmarais, A. J. Reynolds Mastin, Kilderkin Investments Ltd., Green Door Investments Ltd., Greymac Credit Corp., Maysfield Property Management Inc., Broadhurst & Ball, Kitamura, Yates, Margolis, Mastin & Champagne, Prousky & Biback, Victor Prousky, David Allport;

Parkway Forest Apts. I Ltd., Parkway Forest Apts. II Ltd., Parkway Forest Apts. III Ltd., Parkway Forest Apts. IV Ltd., Parkway Forest Apts. V Ltd., Parkway Forest Apts. VI Ltd., Horizon House Apts. Ltd., Horizon Village Apts Ltd., Summit Place Apts. Ltd., The Town Apts I Ltd., The Town Apts. II Ltd., Bretton Place Apts. I Ltd., Bretton Place Apts. II Ltd., Bretton Place Apts III Ltd., Rosedale East Apts. I Ltd., Rosedale East Apts. II Ltd., Hampton House Apts. I Ltd., Hampton House Apts. II Ltd., Rosebury Square Apts. I Ltd., Rosebury Square Apts. II Ltd., Rosebury Square Apts. III Ltd., Rosebury Square Apts. IV Ltd.;

University City Apts. I Ltd., University City Apts. II Ltd., University City Apts. III Ltd., University City Apts. IV Ltd., University City Apts. V Ltd., Park Place Apts. I Ltd., Park Place Apts. II Ltd., Park Place Apts. III Ltd., Park Place Apts. IV Ltd., Park Place Apts. V Ltd., Park Place Apts. VI Ltd., Grenadier Square Apts. I Ltd., Grenadier Square Apts II Ltd., Clintwood Court Apts.;

Ivordale Apts. Ltd., Maisonette Apts. Ltd., Humber Ridge Apts. Ltd., Morningstar Apts. Ltd., Ainsley Court Apts. Ltd., Craighton Court Apts. Ltd., Charlton Court Apts. Ltd., Don

Ridge Tower Apts. Ltd., Forest Grove Apts. Ltd., Arbour Green Apts. Ltd., Sir John's Glen Apts. Ltd., Millway Village Apts. Ltd., Bay Charles Apts. I Ltd., Bay Charles Apts. II Ltd., defendants.

27. Mr. Peterson: Would the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations advise by virtue of what statute, regulation or other authority does Central Trust have the authority to refuse payment on guaranteed investment certificates or similar evidences of Crown Trust indebtedness to a depositor, because the holder of the GIC, etc., is on a "restricted creditors list"? [Tabled April 20, 1983]

Hon. Mr. Elgie: The registrar and Central, on advice of counsel, has refused payment on guaranteed investment certificates or similar evidences of the indebtedness of Crown Trust to certain creditors where the money on deposit may be the subject of a counterclaim or may be set off against an amount owing in any suit involving those named on the list.

OPTED-OUT DOCTORS

28. Mr. McClellan: Will the Minister of Health table by region and by medical specialty the most current numbers and percentages of doctors opted out of OHIP? Will the minister also table the most recent figures on the total number of doctors opted out of OHIP, together with number and percentage of (1) general practitioners, and (2) specialists?

What is the dollar value, the number and the percentage of OHIP billings submitted on an opted-out basis in relation to total OHIP billings (a) from general practitioners, (b) from specialists, (c) from anaesthetists, (d) from obstetricians and gynecologists, (e) from general surgeons, and (f) from ophthalmologists? [Original notice February 14, 1983, tabled April 21, 1983]

See sessional paper 54.

STATUS OF CANDIDATES AND FORMER MEMBERS

30. Mr. Roy: Could the Premier indicate, of those individuals who ran as nominated candidates for the Ontario Progressive Conservative Party during the 1981 provincial general election and who subsequently lost, which of those individuals have, since that time, been appointed, assigned or hired by or to a ministry, agency, board, commission, post or other such position, of a remunerative or nonremunerative nature, over which the Ontario government has the power to make the decision of appointment,

assignment or hiring? In addition to naming those individuals, could the Premier indicate the nature of the appointment, assignment or hiring, and could he indicate, where such is the case, the level of remuneration? [Original notice September 24, 1982, tabled April 22, 1983]

31. Mr. Roy: Could the Premier indicate, of those individuals who ran as nominated candidates for the Ontario Progressive Conservative Party during the 1977 provincial general election and who subsequently lost, which of those individuals have, since that time, been appointed, assigned or hired by or to a ministry, agency, board, commission, post or other such position, of a remunerative or nonremunerative nature, over which the Ontario government has the power to make the decision of appointment, assignment or hiring? In addition to naming those individuals, could the Premier indicate the nature of the appointment, assignment or hiring, and could he indicate, where such is the case, the level of remuneration? [Original notice September 24, 1982, tabled April 22, 1983]

32. Mr. Roy: Could the Premier indicate, of those individuals who ran as nominated candidates for the Ontario Progressive Conservative Party during the 1975 provincial general election and who subsequently lost, which of those individuals have, since that time, been appointed, assigned or hired by or to a ministry, agency, board, commission, post or other such position, of a remunerative or nonremunerative nature, over which the Ontario government has the power to make the decision of appointment, assignment or hiring? In addition to naming those individuals, could the Premier indicate the nature of the appointment, assignment or hiring, and could he indicate, where such is the case, the level of remuneration? [Original notice September 24, 1982, tabled April 22, 1983]

33. Mr. Roy: Could the Premier indicate, of those individuals who ran as nominated candidates for the Ontario Progressive Conservative Party during the 1971 provincial general election and who subsequently lost, which of those individuals have, since that time, been appointed, assigned or hired by or to a ministry, agency, board, commission, post or other such position, of a remunerative or nonremunerative nature, over which the Ontario government has the power to make the decision of appointment, assignment or hiring? In addition to naming those individuals, could the Premier indicate the nature of the appointment, assignment or hiring, and could he indicate, where such is the

case, the level of remuneration? [Original notice September 24, 1982, tabled April 22, 1983]

34. Mr. Roy: Could the Premier indicate which former Progressive Conservative members of the Legislature have been appointed, assigned or hired since 1970 by or to a ministry, agency, board, commission, post or other such position, of a remunerative or nonremunerative nature, over which the Ontario government has the power to make the decision of appointment, assignment or hiring? In addition to naming those individuals, could the Premier indicate the nature of the appointment, assignment or hiring, and could he indicate, where such is the case, the level of remuneration? [Original notice September 24, 1982, tabled April 22, 1983]

Hon. Mr. Davis: Since the names of all appointees are already a matter of public record, the expenditure of time and effort required to provide the information in question would not be commensurate with the benefits to be derived thereby.

ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD APPOINTMENT

184. Mr. Roy: Could the Premier indicate whether there was any communication, either oral or written, on or after September 21, 1982, between himself or members of his staff and Mr. Morley Rosenberg, Mr. E. Goodman, Mr. Hoskinson, the Premier or anyone in the Premier's office, concerning the Toronto Star story, dated September 21, 1982, referring to the matter of Mr. Rosenberg and his request for an appointment to the provincial court bench and his actual appointment to the Ontario Municipal Board? Could the Premier indicate the substance of such communication? [Original notice October 1, 1982, tabled April 22, 1983]

186. Mr. Roy: Could the Premier table all correspondence since January 1, 1980, between his office and Mr. Morley Rosenberg, Mr. E. Goodman, Mr. Hoskinson, the Ministry of the Attorney General or anyone in the Premier's office, or any other individual concerning the question of the appointment of Mr. Rosenberg to the provincial court bench, the Ontario Municipal Board or any other position over which the Ontario government has the power to make the appointment? [Original notice October 1, 1982, tabled April 22, 1983]

Hon. Mr. Davis: No record is kept of communications, apart from correspondence, with persons who might contact this office. The only

correspondence on file in this matter is the one letter which is already a matter of public record.

NORONTAIR HEADQUARTERS

192. Mr. T. P. Reid: Will the Minister of Northern Affairs table the report relating to the headquarters of norOntair? Who wrote the report? When was it available to the minister? [Tabled April 29, 1983]

Hon. Mr. Bernier: norOntair is administered by the Ontario Northland Transportation Commission, through contractual arrangements with a number of northern commercial air carriers who operate a total of nine government-owned de Havilland Twin Otter aircraft, which serve 21 northern Ontario communities.

The aircraft are leased by the ONTC to the carriers who operate route patterns established by the Ministry of Northern Affairs in consultation with the Ministry of Transportation and Communications. Overall corporate services provided by ONTC, include marketing, ground handling services and the provision of major spare parts and specialized equipment.

The ONTC personnel who perform these duties are located at ONTC's headquarters in North Bay.

Current priorities and trends have indicated a need to adjust norOntair services to meet forecast demand for local and feeder air services in northern Ontario. A major initiative has been the purchase of two Dash-8 aircraft to supplement and complement norOntair's existing services.

A full review is now under way at ONTC, MTC and in my ministry to determine the optimum use of these two pressurized turbo-prop airplanes. Any decision which might affect the location of the headquarters of ONTC's norOntair personnel has been delayed pending the outcome of this review.

INTERIM ANSWERS

8, 9, 15 to 17, 29, 35 to 183, 185, 187 to 191, 193 to 195: The following statement was prepared under Cabinet Office letterhead.

The government will attempt to provide an answer to as many questions as possible before the prorogation of this session. It should be noted, however, that the tremendous increase in the number and complexity of questions placed on the order paper could require that increased amounts of time and manpower be diverted from present assignments in order to provide the information requested. An alternative would be to increase the resources allotted to the performance of this function. At a time when the government is endeavouring to adhere to an ongoing restraint program, neither course of action would seem to be appropriate.

Should there be questions that cannot be answered within the stated period, given these circumstances, members should note that sources other than the order paper may be utilized as part of the search for such information.

For example, the Public Accounts of Ontario will be of assistance in regard to many of the questions dealing with expenditures. Questions of this nature can also be directed towards the ministers responsible for such transactions during the estimates process.

All honourable members enjoy access to the research and information services provided by the legislative library, and all parties possess their own research capabilities funded through their budgets.

It is hoped that through a combination of these approaches, with the full co-operation of ministers and members, all honourable members will be able to attain the information that they seek.

Every effort will be made to answer the following questions on or before December 31, 1983: 8, 9, 15 to 17, 29, 35 to 183, 185, 187 to 191, 193 to 195.

CONTENTS

Friday, May 20, 1983

Statements by the ministry

Baetz, Hon. R. C., Minister of Tourism and Recreation:	
Fort Henry guard.	939
Drea, Hon. F., Minister of Community and Social Services:	
Preakness Stakes.	940
McCaffrey, Hon. B., Minister of Citizenship and Culture:	
McMichael Canadian Collection.	938
McMurtry, Hon. R. R., Attorney General:	
Construction Lien Act.	951

Oral questions

Baetz, Hon. R. C., Minister of Tourism and Recreation:	
Fair exchange rates, Mr. Eakins.	952
Elgie, Hon. R. G., Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations:	
Gasoline prices, Mr. Conway, Mr. Rae.	940
Gasoline prices, Mr. Rae, Mr. Ruston, Mr. Swart.	945
Grossman, Hon. L. S., Minister of Health:	
Paramedic program, Mr. Conway, Mr. McClellan.	942
Chronic care facility, Mr. Wrye, Mr. Cooke.	946
Leluk, Hon. N. G., Minister of Correctional Services:	
Overcrowded correctional facilities, Mr. Philip.	952
McMurtry, Hon. R. R., Attorney General:	
Construction Lien Act, Mr. Breaugh.	950
Ramsay, Hon. R. H., Minister of Labour:	
Safety standards in mining industry, Mr. Rae, Mr. Wildman.	944
TTC safety standards, Mr. Wildman, Mr. Wrye.	950
Walker, Hon. G. W., Minister of Industry and Trade:	
Closure of Clarke Irwin, Mr. Allen, Mr. Conway.	947
Welch, Hon. R. S., Minister of Energy and Deputy Premier:	
Niagara River water quality, Mr. Kerrio, Mr. Swart.	949

Petition

Conversion of rental units, Mr. Ruprecht, tabled.	953
--	-----

Motion

House sittings, Mr. Wells, agreed to.	953
--	-----

First readings

Andonald Enterprises Limited Act, Bill Pr29, Ms. Fish, agreed to.	953
Bernard Betel Centre for Creative Living Act, Bill Pr20, Mr. Cousens, agreed to.	953

Class Actions Act, Bill 47, Mr. Swart, agreed to.	954
--	------------

Committee of supply

Estimates, Ministry of Government Services, Mr. Wiseman, Mr. Haggerty, Mr. Philip	954
--	------------

Other business

Spring fair, Mr. Rae, Mr. Walker.	937
NHL franchise for Saskatoon, Mr. Wrye.	937
Attendance in House, Mr. Riddell, Mr. Newman, Mr. Nixon.	937
Response to written questions, Mr. Nixon.	953
Estimates, Mr. Wells.	954
Peace demonstration, Mr. R. F. Johnston, Mr. Wiseman, Mr. Philip.	959
Adjournment.	967

Appendix

Answers to questions on Notice Paper

Bernier, Hon. L., Minister of Northern Affairs:

norOntair headquarters, question 192, Mr. T. P. Reid.	973
--	------------

Davis, Hon. W. G., Premier:

Status of candidates and former members, questions 30 to 34, Mr. Roy.	971
Ontario Municipal Board appointment, questions 184, 186, Mr. Roy.	972

Elgie, Hon. R. G., Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations:

Trust companies, questions 10 to 14, 18 to 27, Mr. Peterson.	969
---	------------

Grossman, Hon. L. S., Minister of Health:

Psychiatric patients, questions 1 and 2, Mr. McClellan.	968
Queen Street Mental Health Centre, question 3, Mr. McClellan.	968
Number of hospital beds, question 4, Mr. McClellan.	968
Mental health services, question 5, Mr. McClellan.	968
Opted-out doctors, question 28, Mr. McClellan.	971

Ramsay, Hon. R. H., Minister of Labour:

Workers' Compensation Board, question 7, Mr. Di Santo.	969
---	------------

Walker, Hon. G. W., Minister of Industry and Trade:

Information on municipalities, question 6, Mr. Eakins.	968
Interim answers, questions 8, 9, 15 to 17, 29, 35 to 183, 185, 187 to 191, 193 to 195.	973

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Allen, R. (Hamilton West NDP)
Baetz, Hon. R. C., Minister of Tourism and Recreation (Ottawa West PC)
Boudria, D. (Prescott-Russell L)
Breaugh, M. J. (Oshawa NDP)
Conway, S. G. (Renfrew North L)
Cooke, D. S. (Windsor-Riverside NDP)
Cousens, D., Deputy Chairman and Acting Speaker (York Centre PC)
Cureatz, S. L., Deputy Speaker and Chairman (Durham East PC)
Drea, Hon. F., Minister of Community and Social Services (Scarborough Centre PC)
Eakins, J. F. (Victoria-Haliburton L)
Elgie, Hon. R. G., Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (York East PC)
Grossman, Hon. L. S., Minister of Health (St. Andrew-St. Patrick PC)
Haggerty, R. (Erie L)
Johnston, R. F. (Scarborough West NDP)
Kerrio, V. G. (Niagara Falls L)
Leluk, Hon. N. G., Minister of Correctional Services (York West PC)
Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
McCaffrey, Hon. R. B., Minister of Citizenship and Culture (Armourdale PC)
McClellan, R. A. (Bellwoods NDP)
McMurtry, Hon. R. R., Attorney General (Eglinton PC)
Newman, B. (Windsor-Walkerville L)
Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
Philip, E. T. (Etobicoke NDP)
Rae, R. K. (York South NDP)
Ramsay, Hon. R. H., Minister of Labour (Sault Ste. Marie PC)
Riddell, J. K. (Huron-Middlesex L)
Ruprecht, T. (Parkdale L)
Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
Swart, M. L. (Welland-Thorold NDP)
Turner, Hon. J. M., Speaker (Peterborough PC)
Walker, Hon. G. W., Minister of Industry and Trade (London South PC)
Welch, Hon. R. S., Minister of Energy and Deputy Premier (Brock PC)
Wells, Hon. T. L., Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Scarborough North PC)
Wildman, B. (Algoma NDP)
Wiseman, Hon. D. J., Minister of Government Services (Lanark PC)
Wrye, W. M. (Windsor-Sandwich L)

JUL 5 1984

